



# General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

**49<sup>th</sup>** plenary meeting

Wednesday, 12 November 2014, 10 a.m.  
New York

Official Records

*President:* Mr. Kutesa ..... (Uganda)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.*

## Agenda item 119

### Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters

**The President:** Members will recall that one of the priorities I have set for this session is advancing the revitalization of the General Assembly and the reform of the Security Council. As members well know, the road towards the reform of the Security Council has thus far been a long and winding journey. At the 2005 World Summit, leaders expressed support for reform of the Council

“in order to make it more broadly representative, efficient and transparent and thus to further enhance its effectiveness and the legitimacy and implementation of its decisions” (*resolution 60/1, para. 153*).

At the start of this year’s session, more than 100 leaders expressed concern at the lack of progress in the negotiations on Security Council reform 10 years since the World Summit. We therefore need to renew the commitment of all Member States to the reform agenda and the next phase of the intergovernmental negotiations. Above all, we must undertake this endeavour in a steadfast state of compromise. I am optimistic that today’s debate will provide a clearer picture of the challenges we have to surmount and the opportunities that we must then harness to advance the reform process. Although the task may seem daunting,

together we can make progress on this critical undertaking.

Since the founding of the Organization nearly 70 years ago, the world has undergone profound change. The challenges we face have become more complex given the wide range of new and emerging threats to international peace and security. We therefore need to reform the Security Council, in particular to make it more representative, effective and efficient. Indeed, our Organization should continue to adapt to the constructs and exigencies of our present-day world in order to be effective and relevant. It is therefore in the best interests of all Member States to take the necessary steps to reform the Security Council so as to preserve its fundamental role in the maintenance of international peace and security for generations to come.

As the reform discussions move forward, it is important to ensure that they are not a mere repetition of previously stated positions — a dynamic that has characterized the intergovernmental negotiation process in the past. What is now required is a firm commitment to moving the process to text-based negotiation on all clusters. The mandate for negotiations firmly belongs to all the Member States. It is my hope that today’s debate will serve as a useful foundation for future reform and galvanize productive negotiations over the coming months.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for spearheading the intergovernmental negotiations for the past years. As representatives

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

14-62259 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



are aware, I have appointed Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform, and I call upon all members to support him in advancing this process. We must collectively move the negotiation process forward, as that effort is important not only for ensuring the effective functioning of the Security Council, but also for preserving its legitimacy.

**Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate. We express our appreciation to Ambassador John Ashe, President of the General Assembly at its sixty-eighth session, and Ambassador Tanin, former Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform, for their efforts. We take note of the recent oral decision of the General Assembly on the reform of the Security Council, which will enable the continuation of the negotiations during the sixty-ninth session.

We underscore the validity and relevance of the Movement's principled position concerning the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council, and other matters related to the Security Council. I refer in particular to the directives the Movement adopted at its eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth summits, which have been reflected in the Movement's position and negotiating papers, and to the decisions of NAM ministerial conferences and meetings.

The Movement, while appreciating the efforts undertaken so far, notes with concern the lack of important and concrete results during 10 rounds of the intergovernmental negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, based on General Assembly decisions. These negotiations have shown that while a convergence of views has emerged, major differences persist. While some improvements have been made to the working methods of the Council, they have not satisfied even the minimum expectations of the general membership of the United Nations, leaving much room for improvement.

Decision 62/557 is and will continue to be the basis of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. Reform of the Security Council should

be comprehensive, addressing all substantive issues relating to, *inter alia*, the question of membership, regional representation, the Council's agenda and its working methods and decision-making process, including the veto. It should garner the widest possible political acceptance of Member States, in line with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and relevant General Assembly decisions, particularly decision 62/557. We are confident that those clear references will guide the work of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, in his newly assumed position as Chair of intergovernmental negotiations. We take this opportunity to wish him all success and to assure him of NAM's commitment to the reform of the Security Council.

The reform of the Security Council should be addressed in a timely, comprehensive, transparent and balanced manner, without delay and without setting artificial deadlines. It should ensure that the agenda of the Council reflects the needs and interests of developing and developed countries alike in an objective, rational, non-selective and non-arbitrary manner. The enlargement of the Council, the body primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, and the reform of its working methods should result in a democratic, more representative, more accountable and more effective Council. The rules of procedure of the Security Council, which have remained provisional for more than 60 years, should be formalized in order to improve its transparency and accountability.

Transparency, openness and consistency are key elements that the Security Council should observe in all its activities, approaches and procedures. Regrettably, the Council has neglected those important factors on numerous occasions. Such instances include unscheduled open debates with selective notification; reluctance to convene open debates on some issues of high significance; repeatedly restricting participation in some open debates; discriminating between members and non-members of the Council, particularly with regard to sequencing and time limits on statements during open debates; failure to submit special, analytical reports to the General Assembly, as required under Article 24 of the Charter; the submission of annual reports still lacking sufficient information and analytical content; and lack of minimal parameters for the elaboration of the monthly assessment of Security Council presidencies.

In recent years, the Security Council has been too quick to threaten or authorize enforcement action in some cases, while being silent and inactive in others. Furthermore, the Council has increasingly resorted to Chapter VII of the Charter as an umbrella for addressing issues that do not necessarily pose an immediate threat to international peace and security. A careful review of those trends indicates that the Council could have opted for alternative provisions to respond more appropriately in particular cases. Instead of excessive and premature resort to Chapter VII, efforts should be made to fully utilize the provisions of Chapters VI and VIII for the pacific settlement of disputes. Chapter VII should be invoked as a measure of last resort, as intended. Unfortunately, provisions of Articles 41 and 42 have been too quickly resorted to in some cases, while other options have not been fully explored and exhausted.

Security Council-imposed sanctions remain an issue of serious concern to non-aligned countries. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the imposition of sanctions should be considered only after all means of peaceful settlement of disputes under Chapter VI of the Charter have been exhausted and after a thorough consideration undertaken of the short-term and long-term effects of such sanctions. Sanctions are a blunt instrument, the use of which raises fundamental ethical questions of whether inflicting suffering on vulnerable groups in the target country is a legitimate means of exerting pressure.

The objectives of sanctions are not to punish or otherwise exact retribution on the populace. In that regard, the objectives of sanctions regimes should be clearly defined and their imposition should be for a specific time frame and based on tenable legal grounds. They should be lifted as soon as the objectives are achieved.

NAM rejects the use of the Security Council as a tool to pursue national political interests and agendas, thus aggravating rather than alleviating situations, contrary to its mission enshrined in the Charter. We stress the necessity of non-selectivity, impartiality and accountability in the work of the Council and the need for the Council to strictly keep within the powers and functions accorded to it by the Member States under the Charter.

In conclusion, I congratulate Malaysia, Angola and Venezuela as the new NAM members in the Council for the 2015-2016 term and urge them, along with other non-aligned countries that serve in the Security

Council, to help promote and defend the NAM positions and objectives during their tenure. I also seize this opportunity to congratulate New Zealand and Spain on their success in becoming new non-permanent members of the Council for the upcoming two-year term and hope that their presence in the Council will contribute to its effectiveness and efficiency in carrying out its mandate.

**Mr. Torrington (Guyana):** In today's debate on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 14 States members of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).

CARICOM aligns itself with the statement delivered by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and with the statement to be delivered by the Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia on behalf of the L.69 Group.

Mr. President, at the outset CARICOM thanks you for the high level of verity and commitment accorded to this most important of issues. Indeed, we are fully and firmly in agreement with the sentiments expressed in your inaugural address to this session, in which you stated that "the need to reform the Security Council is urgent" (*A/69/PV.1, p. 3*). CARICOM thanks you for your letter of 10 November through which you informed us of the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on reform of the Security Council. CARICOM views that as a substantive and irrefutable indication of your commitment to advancing progress on the issue, and we offer him our full support. We take this opportunity also to express our appreciation to his predecessor, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for his tireless efforts over the past 10 rounds of intergovernmental negotiations.

For over two decades, the issue of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council has been debated in the Hall. Member States have time and again expressed their varying positions on those issues. However, after all these discussions and after 10 rounds of intergovernmental negotiations, we have very little progress to show for our efforts. That must change, and it must change starting in the sixty-ninth session. CARICOM is of the view that, 10 years after the Organization was mandated by

Heads of State and Government to pursue early reform of the Security Council, the seventieth anniversary of the creation of this most democratic of institutions will be an historic and timely opportunity to demonstrate the international community's resolve to ensure that the United Nations and all its principal organs remain relevant and equipped to address the multidimensional challenges of today's geopolitical realities.

As we chart the way forward for a post-2015 development agenda, it is fitting that at the same time we chart the course forward for international peace and security. To accomplish those ends, we must fulfil our collective responsibility to bring about the meaningful reform that is in the best interests of the United Nations and the peoples of the world. The objective of such reform must be to make the Organization, and in particular the Security Council — the primary organ with the responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the world — more representative, democratic, accountable, accessible and effective.

The intergovernmental negotiations launched through decision 62/557, with much hope and expectation for progress, provided a format through which Member States could negotiate the numerous positions on this important issue and, through such negotiation, build on areas of convergence and bridge the varying areas of divergence. Six years later, we have seen that merely reiterating our positions does not qualify as negotiations. There has been no real give-and-take within those 10 rounds of intergovernmental negotiations. Positions have not merged or moved. Gaps have not been narrowed and areas of commonalities have not been grasped as building blocks towards advancing the issue.

It is for that reason that CARICOM submits that the eleventh round of intergovernmental negotiations must be qualitatively different from the previous rounds. Progress, however little, must be achieved by the end of this session. It is therefore our expectation that the next round of intergovernmental negotiations will be conducted on the basis of a text, in keeping with the President Kutesa's encouragement expressed in his 10 November letter to Member States. CARICOM expects that such a text, which would reflect the sense of the Assembly after 10 rounds of negotiations and which could be used as a basis for line-by-line and paragraph-by-paragraph negotiations, will be made available to Member States. The options must be based on an objective assessment of our discussions of what

has transpired to date, and they must be presented in a practical, negotiable format in which real give-and-take negotiations can begin.

As we chart the way forward, the basis presented must clearly show where the varying positions of Member States converge and where gaps remain, and it must reflect the positions of all Member States, including of course, the majority. In that endeavour, we assure you, Sir, of our fullest confidence in you as President of the General Assembly and in the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations.

CARICOM has continued to remain seized at the highest political level of the need for definitive progress on this important issue, and our delegations are fully committed to play a constructive role in the process. Allow me therefore to reiterate briefly the position of our region on the key aspects of the reform of the Security Council.

First, CARICOM supports expansion in both the permanent and non-permanent categories of membership. We call for an increase in the size of the Security Council membership from 15 to 27. CARICOM maintains that the role of the developing countries should be advanced and enhanced in both categories. In that regard, CARICOM has been resolute in its support for the inclusion of Africa in the permanent category of membership on the Council. There cannot be a reformed Council without Africa as a permanent and equal member. We call for the provision of a special seat for small island developing States in the reformed Security Council.

CARICOM supports the elimination of the veto. However, in the event of its retention, we consider that all permanent members of a reformed Security Council must have the same rights and privileges. We call for improved working methods of the Council in order to increase the involvement of non-members in its work and to enhance its accountability and transparency.

With regard to the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly, CARICOM recommends that appropriate measures be adopted to enable the General Assembly to function effectively as the chief deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the United Nations.

To conclude, let me assure you, Mr. President, of the full support of the CARICOM delegations as you seek to advance the important cause of Security Council reform. A legitimate Council must be more broadly



representative of twenty-first-century realities, more efficient and transparent in its work, and accountable to the general membership of the United Nations.

**Mr. Patriota** (Brazil): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Group of Four (G4) countries: Brazil, Germany, India and Japan.

I would like to start by thanking you, Sir, for your letter of 10 November, in which you announced the appointment of the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. Let me assure Ambassador Rattray that the G4 is encouraged by his appointment and is committed to working closely with him with a view to achieving the much-needed and long-awaited reform of the Security Council. Allow me to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Zahir Tanin once more for his invaluable work and tireless efforts during the past five years to move that process forward.

I would also like to commend you, Mr. President, for your strong commitment to the cause of Security Council reform, which is undoubtedly very clear after less than two months in office. In your capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda, you have been following this issue very closely for a long time, having personally participated in the adoption of the Ezulwini Consensus. You therefore understand more than anyone else the urgency of the matter.

The sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly brought important developments to the intergovernmental process. Former Assembly President John Ashe endorsed the non-paper produced by his Advisory Group, which represents a neutral and objective summary of the main positions expressed over the past 20 years and is now a widely recognized tool to help frame our discussions. When we went through another series of meetings convened by Ambassador Tanin, based on the five clusters established by decision 62/557, some convergences were clearly identified, especially with respect to the existence of a clear majority in favour of expanding both categories of membership.

In his assessment of the current state of play, circulated to the membership on 9 July, Ambassador Tanin also recognized the proactive tone and momentum achieved at the most recent session and, looking ahead, he pointed out that a text-based discussion remains the logical evolution for this process. That is why the G4

believes it is imperative to start the first meeting of the next round of the intergovernmental negotiations with a text on the table. We cannot allow the next round of the intergovernmental process to be yet another merry-go-round.

As for those who state that there must be a prior consensus before presenting the intergovernmental negotiations with a working document, let me point out that such a requirement has no precedent in any other United Nations process. In fact, that line of thought could actually be considered anti-United Nations. As a matter of fact, in his statement delivered at the meeting on the roll-over decision held on 8 September, former President Ashe stressed that a negotiating text needs sufficiently wide but not necessarily universal agreement. I assure the Assembly that the G4 remains ready to start real negotiations on Security Council reform at any time. Negotiations, however, do not happen in a vacuum. Relying on your authority and mandate as President of this body, Sir, we therefore ask you to empower the new Chair by yourself putting forward a negotiating text that does not prejudice any positions or outcomes.

There is a prevailing view among Member States and among civil society that the Security Council is not capable of responding satisfactorily to specific crises around the world. One can clearly identify a growing sense of frustration arising from the paralysis in the efforts to reform it. During the last general debate, over 100 delegations stressed the need for reform.

Let us recall that 2015 will mark 50 years since the first and only time that the Security Council was reformed, 15 years since the Millennium Summit and 10 years since the 2005 World Summit, when world leaders unanimously called for early reform of the Security Council. If we leave things as they are, we run the risk of bringing discredit and erosion of authority to the United Nations in a core area of its mandate. It is time to fulfil the mandate given to us by our Heads of State and Government — a call that was reiterated by the Foreign Ministers of the G4 at their most recent meeting, held in New York on 26 September. As the former Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations pointed out in his aforementioned assessment, the seventieth anniversary of the Organization in 2015 will provide a “tremendous opportunity” for achieving the much needed reform. The G4, in close cooperation with the rest of the membership, will keep working towards that goal and believes it is achievable.

**Ms. Rambally** (Saint Lucia): I have the honour to take the floor today on behalf of the L.69 Group, a diverse group of 42 developing countries from Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific that are united by a common cause — to achieve lasting and comprehensive reforms of the Security Council. Our Group is bound by the firm conviction that expansion in both the permanent and non-permanent categories of membership of the Security Council is imperative in order to better reflect contemporary world realities and achieve a more accountable, representative, transparent and, more importantly, a relevant Security Council.

Let me begin by placing on record our Group's appreciation of Ambassador Tanin for leading the process thus far. We are heartened by the strong emphasis and high priority that you, Sir, attach to this long-debated subject, and we compliment you on appointing Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations to lead us forward on this important debate. His appointment is a welcome development, as it brings not only fresh leadership but, we hope, increased momentum through innovative ideas to what has been largely a stalled process to date.

After 10 rounds and seven years of intergovernmental negotiations, nothing has changed on this subject except for the efforts made by the leadership of the General Assembly, which has done its utmost on the issue. The intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform were mandated to commence text-based negotiations. As many as 140 countries — far more than two-thirds majority — made a formal and written submission to the Chair in 2009 asking him to initiate a text-based negotiation process. However, we have been repeatedly airing statements of known positions and we continue to call upon the Chair to conduct negotiations on the basis of a text, an approach in keeping with requests to all other chairs in all other United Nations processes. This request is consistent with what we know to be United Nations practice.

With the seventieth anniversary year of the United Nations approaching, it simply cannot therefore be business as usual. We cannot embark upon the next round of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform with the same stasis and vacuum that has characterized the last 10 rounds. The process will only move forward if you, Sir, as the President of the General Assembly, mandate the Chair to conduct negotiations at the soonest on the basis of a

text that is tabled with your full authority and backing. However, if we allow the self-defeating argument of consensus to emerge even before the commencement of negotiations as a precondition for commencing text-based negotiations, then we are simply trying to stall any forward movement on the process, which only suits the interests of a limited minority of objectors.

We therefore count and call upon your leadership, Sir, as the President of the General Assembly, to ensure that the eleventh round does not amount to an exercise in statement-making but is a real process of negotiations, where representatives focus their energies, line by line and paragraph by paragraph, on arriving on at least a bracketed text by the conclusion of the sixty-ninth session.

According to your own estimates, Sir, more than 100 Heads of State and Government, in their statements made during the high-level segment of the Assembly's sixty-ninth session, called for urgent reform of the Security Council. All our Heads of State and Government unanimously made the same request back in 2005. It is therefore a courtesy to the Heads of State and Government that we provide them with some feedback on what we have achieved on the subject — if anything at all in this process — when they gather for the seventieth anniversary summit next year. We therefore hope that once we commence the text-based negotiation process under your leadership, Mr. President, we would be able to provide our leaders, when they meet next year, with a platform through which a concrete outcome on this long-standing subject could eventually be arrived at.

It was in 1963, 51 years ago, that the General Assembly enlarged the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15, which was a modest increase of four in the non-permanent category only. Since then, the membership of the United Nations has increased from 113 to 193. Eighty more countries have been added, but their addition has not altered the composition of the world's premier body mandated to maintain international peace and security.

We have a truly bizarre situation today, when nearly 75 per cent of the work of the Security Council is focused exclusively on the continent of Africa, while ever since its inception the body has not had even one permanent member from the whole of the 54-State African membership. It is therefore critical that we move ahead with a results-based timeline as an absolute imperative. The use of superficial arguments aimed at

avoiding the imposition of artificial timelines while calling for fixed timelines in all other United Nations processes reflects an attempt at doublespeak. It is our Group's firm conviction that the year 2015 — which will be the seventieth anniversary year of the United Nations and the tenth anniversary year of the 2005 World Summit in which all our Heads of State and Government mandated us to achieve early reforms of the Security Council — would be a reasonably early date to show progress on this unanimous mandate.

As the only group that has increased in membership over the years, and in keeping with our tradition of active support for the reform process, the L.69 Group has also put forward a number of proposals for turning our interactions and deliberations into real negotiations. As a group with perhaps the largest convergence of like-minded countries from the developing world, the L.69 Group has been able to significantly enhance convergences with the African Group and forge a common position that embraces comprehensive reforms. It has deliberately avoided a piecemeal approach that some of the detractors of any forward movement on reforms have used to hold the process hostage.

Let me reiterate once again that the L.69 Group acknowledges and supports the African common position as enunciated in the Ezulwini Consensus. Such enhancement of convergences benefits the momentum contributing to the forward movements of intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform process, which may also be recognized in the negotiation text.

Today, when we see the inability of the Security Council to respond in a timely manner to pressing issues of war and peace, when we see the Council being increasingly exposed to public scrutiny, when large sections of civil society and academia are questioning not just its representativeness but its credibility — even to the extent of Member States rejecting seats after getting elected — we should be seen to be constructively engaged in restoring the dignity of this premier body by reforming it to reflect contemporary world realities. The L.69 Group is committed to playing its part in ensuring that this result, which we all envisage, is not left to future generations but brought about here and now, under your able stewardship, Mr. President.

**Mr. Cardì** (Italy): On behalf of the group of States known as Uniting for Consensus, I wish to express our appreciation to you, Mr. President, for your new approach to Security Council reform and

for your willingness to work in close cooperation and consultation with the entire membership of the United Nations.

The first concrete sign of this willingness was in the lead-up to the appointment of a new facilitator for the reform process. We warmly welcome Ambassador Courtney Rattray in his new capacity. We are sure he will work with the effectiveness and balance with which the entire membership accredits him, and we wish to immediately offer him our full cooperation and support as he assumes this new pivotal responsibility. I would also take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Zahir Tanin for his efforts and for the passion he put into his work. We also thank the former President of the General Assembly for his leadership.

For the past 20 years, we have been working on Security Council reform, ever since the establishment of the Open-ended Working Group in 1993. It has been a long journey, in which fewer gains have been made than were expected. Nonetheless, we believe that much has been learned in the process. The main lesson learned is that divisive solutions are bound to fail and that they risk creating complications and delaying the reform process. If we want to achieve meaningful progress in the intergovernmental negotiations, we must go beyond our traditional proposals and reach out to the other sides. Only then will we be able to achieve the broad political acceptance that such a crucial reform requires.

Beyond this, discussions in recent years, including the last round of intergovernmental negotiations, have highlighted the principles that should lead to reform of the Security Council. We believe the entire membership subscribes to the goal of a more representative, democratic, accountable and effective Council. But can we agree on how to achieve that?

The intention of enlarging the Security Council is to make it more representative. And indeed one could argue that from a purely numerical perspective, the Council has become less representative of the overall United Nations membership over the years. But it will take more than an increase in membership to make the Council more representative. It will also require increasing the possibility that all Member States can periodically sit on the Council, and the best way to do that is to increase the number of elected seats, a measure that would also make the Security Council more democratic and accountable to the membership as a whole — that is, to the General Assembly.

Allocating new permanent seats on a national basis, rather than making the Council more representative, would only enable a still-limited number of countries to occupy seats forever, thus perpetuating a situation whereby more than one third of the entire membership has never sat on the Council. It would make the Council more exclusive rather than more inclusive and would still fail to meet the need for more democracy and accountability.

We also need a more effective Security Council. Accountability and effectiveness go hand in hand, since the Council's decisions must be fully endorsed by the United Nations membership. Uniting for Consensus would also like to enable Member States willing to contribute significantly to the Council's work to serve for longer periods and with greater frequency. We are not asking those who aspire to a greater role in the Security Council to renounce their ambitions. On the contrary, we are asking them to maintain their level of commitment and rise to the challenge of a periodic accounting to the membership of their contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security. Uniting for Consensus believes in a new Security Council based on merit, not privilege.

For many years now, small States, which represent almost one fourth of United Nations membership, have been demanding a greater presence on the Security Council. They are increasingly involved in issues related to the maintenance of international peace and security as well as old and new threats. Our work should identify ways to ensure that such States have direct access to the Council. Uniting for Consensus also understands the aspirations of countries on the African continent and remains ready to continue working with Africa to promote equal and non-discriminatory approaches for all groups with regard to their representation on the Council. Elections, especially for smaller and developing countries, are the primary instrument through which they can be heard, on an equal footing and with equal dignity. For that reason, we reiterate our call to those countries, and, of course, to all Member States, to commit to a modern vision of the Security Council and work together to achieve a Council that is accountable to the entire membership of the United Nations.

Uniting for Consensus is the only negotiating group that has already officially introduced two concrete proposals for Security Council reform designed to contribute actively to the negotiating process, and it

continues to work on a basis of progress and compromise. We support a compromise solution, a model that we deem fair and equitable that could reasonably reflect the interests of all. We are ready to discuss such solutions to ensure that they represent the legitimate aspirations of the membership. We must explore the middle ground, and to reach that middle ground we must find a point of convergence. Uniting for Consensus has been working on a proposal that focuses on creating new seats, along with the possibility of longer tenure on the Council and immediate re-election. In our view, that formula would enable those who have the desire and the capacity to contribute more to its work to spend extended periods on the Council. The length of the terms and the possibility of immediate re-election offer a broad range of alternatives that could allow us to identify the point of convergence we are striving for.

Of course, Uniting for Consensus also remains open to considering new ideas in order to bridge gaps between it and other groups. In accordance with that position, in the past few weeks we have begun a preliminary series of informal meetings with the other negotiating groups to explore possible common ground, and we intend to continue on that path. We are among the first to encourage debate, but without artificial deadlines. Uniting for Consensus, no doubt like all the other negotiating groups, has no desire to work in a vacuum or waste any more time.

With genuine political openness, Uniting for Consensus acknowledges the call for text-based negotiations in the President's letter dated 10 November. We have never closed the door on this method of work; in fact, we have often stressed that we should first and foremost agree on such a text. As of now, the only valid document that has the support of the whole membership is the second revision of the compiled text, and we are ready to work in that direction.

We are convinced that any future solution to the Security Council reform process will require willingness to compromise and bold leadership. That approach is at the heart of the Uniting for Consensus commitment. In keeping with decision 62/557, we will continue to engage with flexibility and in a spirit of sincere cooperation in order to achieve a comprehensive reform of the Security Council that benefits the entire membership.

Lastly, I would like to add that it is difficult to understand why anyone would argue against seeking



consensus. The United Nations is stronger when all its members unite behind a single goal.

**Mr. Minah** (Sierra Leone): It is an honour for me to speak on behalf of the Group of African States in today's debate. It presents a welcome opportunity for the African Group to take stock of the recently concluded 10 rounds of intergovernmental negotiations. It is also an opportunity for us to set the stage for the next phase, which we hope will move the process in a meaningful direction aimed at text-based negotiations.

We can all agree that a reformed Security Council must conform to the principles of equitable geographical distribution while maintaining a balance in its relationship with the Assembly as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

Since the adoption of decision 62/557 on 15 September 2008, the reform process has moved on cautiously, but not at a pace to our liking. Delegations have stated and repeated their positions and made clear where they stand on the various key issues. Convergences, divergences and areas of possible collaboration are now very well known. At this stage, we believe that the exchanges of the 10 rounds have made clear what we need to focus on. It is therefore our hope that the next session will focus on a text for negotiation that will dictate the future progress of this process.

The African Group has consistently stated the imperative of comprehensively reforming the Security Council to address the historical injustice that leaves Africa as the only continent not represented in the permanent category of Council membership and underrepresented in the non-permanent category. Africa's common position, as reflected in the Ezulwini Consensus and Sirte Declaration, is well known. We have always expressed reservations about the process of negotiations itself, because we are engaged in intergovernmental negotiations that are not true negotiations. We have nonetheless continued in a spirit of good faith and continue to be engaged and commit to discussions and collaborations with our partners and other delegations.

The sense in the Assembly over the past 10 rounds was that a good majority of delegations are in favour of an expansion in both categories of membership. There was considerable support for the inclusion of small and medium-sized States and for an enhanced African representation in an expanded Security Council. There

is no doubt our past exchanges have yielded some progress, but we are in danger of the process becoming sterile and moribund. At this stage, the African Group calls for modalities to establish a timeline for negotiations. We call for all delegations, all groups and all those interested in Security Council reform to move towards the process of real negotiations. The point we make is simply this: only real negotiations can lead to real reform.

The African Group reiterates its resolve to continue to work towards building alliances and narrowing down differences, with particular focus on substance and not so much on procedure. We wish to underscore and put on record the continuing progressive and encouraging consultations we have had with a number of groups, including but not limited to the L.69 Group, the Caribbean Community and the Pacific Forum. Africa stands ready, willing and able to continue to engage, collaborate and cooperate to move this process forward. We look forward to a negotiation on a text. The boundaries of that negotiation have yet to be set, and obviously there needs to be preliminary agreement on the principles and substance regarding the various issues.

We are grateful to Ambassador Tanin for his sterling service and the long hours, weeks, months and years he has put into this process, and we welcome the appointment of the representative of Jamaica to join us in our common cause. As a group, we remain committed to working together with any group that wishes to achieve our ultimate objective of a representative, accountable, democratic, truly representative and truly transparent Security Council.

The African position has gained and continues to gain support. We are grateful to the L.69 Group for today explicitly endorsing the African position. Our principals, our Heads of State, have made it quite clear that we must move towards concrete action on Security Council reform. Having gone through 10 rounds and several informal and formal discussions, every group is aware of one another's position and every group is aware of the limits of each other's position. The next logical step must be negotiations.

With a new facilitator, we believe there will be newfound impetus in this process, and we believe that if we work together as a whole, this illusory consensus that we all seek will actually become a reality. There is no greater issue in front of us as an Assembly than the revitalization of this Organization, in which the

reform of the Security Council plays a key part. The African Group remains open to all informal approaches and will continue its process of outreach to all groups, both those closely aligned with our positions and those that have significant concerns regarding our position, because we believe our position, given the historical injustice, is legitimate, and we believe that our position can survive any process of negotiation.

**Mr. Alotaibi** (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am honoured to read this statement on behalf of the Group of Arab States. At the outset, I would like assure you, Sir, of the support of our Group in your leadership of the Assembly's work at this session. I would also like to thank Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for his efforts in facilitating the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. We also welcome the appointment of Ambassador Rattray to lead the next cycle of talks.

The international community is faced with new challenges with increasing frequency, and this strengthens our resolve to enhance the Security Council's role and reform it in order to enable it to be better meet those challenges. That will require the Council to be more representative, transparent, neutral and credible. The question of Security Council reform and equitable representation on the Council are the pillars of the comprehensive reform of the Organization.

More than 20 years after the first discussions on enlarging the Council and improving its methods of work, we have seen a number of initiatives and different positions adopted by groups and Member States, including the Arab Group. It is now necessary to accelerate the reform, especially as there is consensus on the need for reform after the significant changes since the establishment of the Organization in 1945. That does not mean that we should rush, which would prevent us from achieving a consensus-based solution. Establishing a deadline could be an obstacle to a comprehensive solution. In that context, the Arab Group affirms that the intergovernmental negotiations should take place within the context of the General Assembly, as it is the only appropriate venue in which to debate this matter in accordance with decision 62/557 while preserving Member States' ownership of this process.

The Arab Group also affirms that the starting point that we select for resuming the negotiations should include all proposals by Member States. Any changes that might have taken place regarding those proposals

or any linkages between proposals should be taken into account with the consent of the country or group that initially made the proposal. Those are clear criteria that should guide Ambassador Rattray in his work for the resumption of the negotiations, in order to reach a consensus among the different countries regarding the best way to move forward on this important question.

In this context, the Group wishes to highlight the issue of the right of veto. The unjust use of the veto by the Permanent Five (P5) has in many cases helped damage the credibility of the decision-making process in the Security Council. On some occasions it has resulted in the Council being unable to discharge its responsibilities and to take the necessary measures for the maintenance of international peace and security. The use of the veto by the P5 over the past years has reflected their anxious concern to use it to defend their national interests and those of their allies. Despite the limited use of the veto over the past 20 years, compared to previous eras, it still represents an effective way to immunize some Governments against being held accountable. For example, it has been used 15 times in a total of 27 occasions during the last 20 years to protect illegal practices by the Israeli authorities in the occupied Arab territories.

The procedures and working methods must be improved to make them more effective and transparent. Permanent rules should be adopted to replace the temporary ones that have been in effect for a number of years. We should also consider the issue of increasing the number of plenary meetings and strengthening the role of countries that are on the Council's agenda. Such meetings are a genuine opportunity for States not members of the Council to debate Council issues. We must also limit the number of closed meetings — they should be an exception and not the rule. We should publicize Council communiqués and resolutions and consult the countries concerned so that they can participate in discussions concerning them, in accordance with Article 31 of the Charter of the United Nations. We invite subsidiary bodies of the Council to provide thorough information on their activities to Member States. The Arab Group also urges the Council to strictly limit itself to its mandate under the Charter.

The position of member States of the League of Arab States is well known. We are asking for permanent representation as part of any future enlargement of the Council. We refer to the document that was issued by the facilitator. We would also like to reiterate the

importance of the negotiations that took place during the tenth round of intergovernmental negotiations. We absolutely must not set temporary artificial deadlines that could be an obstacle to moving the reform forward. We affirm our willingness to constructively contribute to the work in the sixty-ninth session in order to achieve comprehensive Council reform.

**Ms. Frankinet** (Belgium): I have the pleasure to speak on behalf of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Belgium.

I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this annual debate on Security Council reform. I thank you also for your letter of 10 November, in which you announced the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray as the new Chair of the United Nations intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. We wish Ambassador Rattray all the best in his new position, and we thank him for taking up this challenge. We have full confidence in his ability to successfully lead the intergovernmental negotiations.

The Netherlands and Belgium would also like to pay special tribute to our previous Chair, Ambassador Tanin of Afghanistan, who skilfully and for many years steered the work of the intergovernmental negotiations. We thank Ambassador Tanin and his entire team for all the hard work of the past years. It is fair to say that we did a lot of fruitful and important work during the previous session of the General Assembly. It started with the initiative of a former Assembly President, Ambassador John Ashe, to create an advisory group of the President of the General Assembly on Security Council reform. That advisory group produced a non-paper, which, in our view, offers a very useful tool for our discussions and which has been used as such by many delegations.

Under the leadership of Ambassador Tanin we also held debates on each of the five clusters of Security Council reform and a sixth one on cross-cutting issues. Last summer, at the request of the former President of the General Assembly, Ambassador Tanin shared with us his personal assessment of our work, and he added thought-provoking recommendations on the way forward.

For years now, we have scrutinized Security Council reform from all possible angles. The positions are well known. It is clear where opinions diverge, but it is even clearer where large consensus can be found. No one is waiting for another year of repetitive debates with only slight variations. This year, perhaps more than

ever before, business as usual is no longer an option. So let us build on the results of last year and take the process one step further. We all know how to do this. It has been said many times before, and Ambassador Tanin mentioned it in his recommendations.

Just as in any other process at the General Assembly, we need to engage in a genuine give and take. We need to start real negotiations. And we need to do it on the basis of a text — a text that will be a starting point, not a foregone conclusion, for text-based negotiations will allow us ultimately to converge rather than diverge, regardless of what text is used as a basis. However, we cannot make text-based negotiations conditional upon a pre-existing consensus on the text to be used. That would be equivalent to calling for the solution to be agreed before we actually begin to address the problem.

We count on your determination and guidance, Mr. President, to create a new momentum, because the ultimate goal of our endeavour remains as important as ever: a more effective, transparent, accountable and representative Security Council that reflects the geopolitical realities of the twenty-first century and contributes to a more credible United Nations and a reinforced international system. As always, the Netherlands and Belgium stand ready to fully support both you and the Chair of our working group.

**Mr. Pankin** (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The question of Security Council reform is one of the most important issues on the General Assembly's agenda, as the Council is the body that, according to the Charter of the United Nations, bears the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The final result of the Security Council reform process will largely depend on the effectiveness of the Assembly's efforts and those of the United Nations as a whole, as well as on the international security architecture.

We congratulate the Ambassador of Jamaica, Mr. Rattray, on his appointment as facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations. We hope that his work in this difficult area will help to maintain a constructive atmosphere for the negotiations so that a mutually acceptable solution can be reached. We thank the Ambassador of Afghanistan, Mr. Tanin, for the effective work he carried out for the past five years.

As a permanent member of the Security Council, the Russian Federation notes the need to make that body more representative. However, efforts in that

regard must not impact the Council's ability to promptly and effectively respond to emerging challenges. This is especially crucial today as we are witnessing a proliferation of hot spots of conflict throughout the world. In this context, we call for maintaining a compact Security Council membership. Its optimal number should not exceed a little more than 20 members. We reject any idea that would infringe on the prerogatives of the current permanent Council members, including the veto. We recall that the veto is an important factor in encouraging Council members to seek generally acceptable and balanced solutions. Trying to eliminate the veto would be an historical and political mistake.

The discussion on how to reform the Security Council is difficult and has gone on for quite a while. Ten rounds of intergovernmental negotiations have been held. Member States have made some progress on the reform track, but a comprehensive solution that would satisfy the majority is still not on the horizon. We fully support the opinion, heard often from this rostrum, that the Security Council reform process must be owned by all Member States without exception and, with its signature wording, that it must have the broadest possible support of the membership. If we cannot reach a consensus on this issue, it is politically essential to ensure the support of a much larger number of Member States than the legally required two-thirds majority vote of the General Assembly.

We are convinced that the issue of Security Council reform cannot be resolved by exclusively mathematical means, using various voting models to yield the minimum required number of votes. A result achieved this way would be unlikely to add to the Security Council's authority and effectiveness, and it would certainly not help strengthen our global Organization — quite the contrary.

At the same time, we are ready to consider any reasonable option to enlarge the Council membership, including the so-called intermediate option, that is, a compromise solution, as long as it is based on the broadest possible consensus in the United Nations. However, the status of the negotiations does not allow us to say that we are closer to a universal formula for Security Council reform that would receive the broadest possible support. Approaches still diverge substantially, sometimes diametrically. In such circumstances, we do not see an alternative to continuing, at the current session of the General Assembly, the patient work of bringing positions together.

We hope that the efforts of the President of the General Assembly and the facilitator of the negotiations will be directed specifically at lending as much support to the negotiations as possible, on the understanding that ownership in this process belongs to the Member States. This painstaking work should be conducted in a peaceful, transparent and inclusive manner, without arbitrary timelines. We must all be very mindful that on this matter there is no room for artificial or symbolic deadlines and dates or attempts to resolve this complex problem with the stroke of the pen.

Let us not forget the most important thing — progress on Security Council reform depends only on the political will of Member States and their willingness to reach a reasonable compromise. We call on all States to follow this fundamental principle.

**Mr. Wenaweser** (Liechtenstein): As we approach the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations, the system of international peace and security created by the Charter is still very much at the heart of the international order. When crises erupt — in Syria, Ukraine, the Central African Republic or elsewhere — the international community looks to the Security Council for leadership and guidance. The powers vested in the Council under the Charter are unique, leading to great expectations. All too often, those expectations are not fulfilled. By failing to take a decisive role in conflicts, such as in Syria and Ukraine, the Council risks losing its central role and creating the impression that it can effectively address crises only where permanent members do not feel they have a national stake in the matter.

The 2005 World Summit recognized the necessity of Security Council reform and supported “early reform” of the Council, with leaders committing themselves to continuing their efforts to achieve a decision to this end. We have not come any closer to reforming the Security Council since then. This is not for want of proposals, but for want of genuine engagement. With so much at stake and with no understanding of a timeline and no clear process in place, we all find it easier to repeat our positions than to signal concessions that would allow moving the process forward.

In terms of expanding the Council, my delegation stands by a model that offers a middle ground between the two most extreme positions. That model, which we presented as a full-fledged proposal two years ago, would add a category of long-term elected seats to the Council, with terms of eight or ten years, for example. States in the new category of seats would



be allowed to stand for immediate re-election. States that unsuccessfully sought election for the longer-term seats would be barred from standing for election for the existing two-year seats for the duration of what would have been their term of office. A mandatory review of the mechanism would take place after two terms in the new long-term seats.

This is an intermediate approach in the sense that it seeks to bridge the gap between those who favour expansion in the two existing categories and those who want expansion in the non-permanent category only. But it is not meant to be a transition to a particular final outcome. Much rather, it is a viable model in its own right, albeit with the possibility of further change as part of a review after 20 years or so. We remain convinced that such an approach is the most viable option for expansion, both as far as acceptance in the Assembly and in the necessary ratification process. Moreover, we are deeply sceptical that the addition of more veto-wielding permanent members would truly make the Security Council a more effective institution, and we are of the view that many others share that scepticism.

Anyone unfortunate enough to sit through sessions of the intergovernmental negotiations will hear much of the desirability of a comprehensive solution and why we must avoid a piecemeal approach. We certainly agree that amending the Charter is an enormous task and that we have to produce a package of amendments that covers all aspects of Council reform. It is precisely these amendments that the intergovernmental negotiations are supposed to negotiate. But we do not agree to use this as a pretext to not call on the Council to immediately take what measures it can take to become more transparent, more accountable and more effective. The practice of the Council is evolving and it does make adjustments to the new challenges it faces, although many of us would like to see much more of that. Using enlargement, or absence thereof, as a pretext to not promote this type of improvements is to our mind clearly counterproductive.

We are thinking in particular of the efforts to establish a code of conduct that would limit the use of the veto in situations involving atrocity crimes, a proposal we wholeheartedly support. Such an agreement requires no Charter amendment, nor indeed any action per se by the General Assembly at all. Certainly the agreement on such a code of conduct does not have to wait until we agree on how to expand the Security Council. The same can be said for issues related to the working methods more generally. Decision 62/557,

which created the mandate of the intergovernmental negotiations, is meant to pertain to the working methods of an expanded Security Council and nothing else. It is not a roadblock to practical measures that would make the Council a more effective organ today.

As we ponder how to move the Council reform forward, we cannot see the utility of simply going through the motions in the intergovernmental negotiations as we have for the past five years. Last year's report of the advisory group to the then President John Ashe gives us a solid summary of all of the negotiating positions. The time has come to either try something new or to put the intergovernmental negotiations to rest.

We thank Ambassador Tanin for his tireless efforts for the past five years, and we welcome Ambassador Rattray and wish him every success in his difficult task. We hope that he will take the leadership role traditionally accorded to those who lead negotiations on behalf of the President of the General Assembly. That is how every other membership-driven negotiation in this building works, and we do not see why this one should be any different. Before we begin the intergovernmental negotiations, we would also like to see an assessment from the Chair as to the results he feels are attainable in the current session of the Assembly. That would give us a yardstick whereby to measure our progress.

We stand ready to work with you, Mr. President, and the Chair of the United Nations intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform to make meaningful progress in this session.

**Ms. Jones** (United States of America): The United States is pleased to participate in this annual plenary debate on the important topic of Security Council reform.

Today's debate occurs as we look ahead to the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations next year. The United Nations is a very different place, as is the world. Since its inception, the Organization has grown from 51 Members to 193 Members. The challenges facing us are more complex and more pressing than ever — from addressing the Ebola outbreak to combating the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant to making sure peacekeeping operations in crisis hot spots are successful. To face these issues, we need a Security Council that represents today's realities, one that is fully capable of carrying out its mandate.

The landmark year of 2015 is a compelling moment for the membership to consider appropriate ways to

achieve successful Council reform. The United States continues to believe that it is critical that any reform of the Council enjoys the broadest possible consensus among Member States. To that end, we need to follow a serious, deliberate path forward. The United States is committed to this process and remains open to modest Council expansion in both permanent and non-permanent categories. Any consideration of which countries merit future permanent membership should take into account their ability and willingness to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the United Nations, and their ability to exercise the heavy responsibility that comes with Security Council membership.

My delegation congratulates Ambassador Rattray on his appointment as Chair of the United Nations intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. My delegation also thanks Ambassador Tanin for his leadership of the intergovernmental negotiations process for the past five years. We believe that the intergovernmental negotiations remain the most appropriate forum for continued discussions of Security Council reform.

Finally, we encourage all to approach the upcoming sessions on Security Council reform constructively. We know many Member States feel that the issue has been studied for too long without action. But we hope that, by working together, we can consider a way forward that is agreeable to the broadest possible majority of United Nations members, an arrangement that can best promote the Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, in line with the ideals that were central to the founders of the United Nations.

**Mr. Mukerji** (India): I congratulate you, Mr. President, on your effective and impressive presidency of the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session since you took office in September this year. You have the fullest support of my delegation in assisting you in all your endeavours in this session of the General Assembly.

Allow me to first align myself with the statement delivered by the representative of Saint Lucia on behalf of the L.69 Group, as well as with that delivered by representative of Brazil on behalf of the Group of Four (G4). I would also like to convey my delegation's fullest endorsement of the statement delivered by the representative of Guyana on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).

I would like to submit the following for our consideration today.

First, we warmly welcome the appointment of Ambassador Courtney Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as the Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. We have been impressed by the constructive manner in which Ambassador Rattray has conducted the proceedings of the First Committee, and we are confident that his appointment bodes well for this intergovernmental negotiation. We thank the Ambassador of Afghanistan, Ambassador Tanin, for having skilfully guided our process so far.

We now look to you, Sir, as the President of the General Assembly, to truly empower our Chairman by giving him, under your authority, a text on the basis of which all of us can begin to engage in actual negotiations. This will provide a refreshing contrast to all previous rounds of negotiations so far in this process. We must actually be the only forum in the United Nations to be negotiating without a negotiating text on the table before us. As my delegation has stated so many times in the past, without a negotiation text, it is impossible for any of us to demonstrate our commitment to multilateralism and our flexibility in reaching an outcome to be reported to our Heads of State and Government in September next year.

As in all other negotiating processes under way in the General Assembly, our intergovernmental negotiation should not be perceived to be biased against any individual country or group of countries just because a text is on the table. However, if there is no text on the table, then we would surely have just cause to detect a bias against those of us who are seriously engaged in implementing the explicit mandate for early reform of the Security Council given to us by our leaders in 2005.

Secondly, my delegation is of the firm view that the wish of the vast majority of Member States participating in the intergovernmental negotiation is to recommend expansion in both categories, permanent and non-permanent, of the reformed Security Council. That includes several Member States that do not belong to any groupings, as well as large and pro-reform groupings such as the L.69 Group; the Committee of 10, which represents the Ezulwini Consensus of the Africa Group; CARICOM; small island developing States; the

Group of Four and, most recently, the Group of Arab States with its demand for a permanent seat.

Our assessment is based on the statements made by those Member States in both our intergovernmental negotiation process so far and the more than 100 statements made by Heads of State and Government during the recent high-level segments of the sixty-ninth session, held in September and October. The latter is a recorded fact and must not be ignored or questioned while considering the assertion just made by us.

Thirdly, we believe that to insist that no forward movement can take place in our process until we have complete consensus on any text at the very beginning of the process is not in keeping with the unanimous consensus for early reform of the Council mandated by our leaders in paragraph 153 of the 2005 World Summit outcome document (resolution 60/1). We therefore request that once the negotiation text authorized by you, Mr. President, is placed before us by our new Chair, we engage in the give and take of actual negotiations to define what early reform of the Council actually means for the vast majority of us in the Assembly. It would be a blot on the collective integrity of the Organization if we were to turn our backs on this subject and ignore it completely when our leaders meet next year for the historic seventieth-anniversary summit of the United Nations.

Finally, my delegation would like to once again put this issue in the context in which the Security Council is actually required to function. The Council — which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security under the Charter and which acts under Articles 24, paragraph 1, and Article 25 on behalf of all of us Member States — is today a seriously impaired organ. The litany of crises dotting the international landscape involving the lives of millions of people that the Council does not have the will or the resources to address demonstrates that vividly. Even in the area of its core competence, the Council is unable to act with credibility, essentially due to its unrepresentative nature.

For the Council to become more effective, early reforms, as collectively envisioned by our leaders 10 years ago, are an urgent necessity. Such reforms, if implemented properly, will restore to the Council its credibility, enable it to share the responsibility of its functions with fresh and needed resources, both financial and intellectual, and, most importantly, restore the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter, which

requires recourse to peaceful, non-violent means, based on the rule of law, to settle disputes as the preferred means to maintain international peace and security.

As the Prime Minister of India stated from this very rostrum on 27 September:

“It is important that we improve the Security Council by making it more democratic and participative. Institutions that reflect the imperatives of the twentieth century will not be effective in the twenty-first century. They face the risk of irrelevance” (*A/69/PV.15, p. 17*).

He also said that we would face the risk of continuing turbulence with no one capable of addressing it, adding that we should fulfil our promise to reform the Security Council by 2015.

**Sir Mark Lyall Grant** (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom is grateful for this opportunity to reaffirm publicly our strong commitment to reforming the Security Council.

The United Kingdom warmly welcomes the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. I pay tribute to his predecessor, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, who worked tirelessly to establish a common position from which to move forward together. We thank him for his concerted efforts, which have provided a foundation for the progress we must all work to achieve. We look forward to working closely and productively with Ambassador Rattray and hope that his appointment will invigorate the process and lead it towards an agreed outcome.

The United Kingdom's position on Security Council reform has not changed. The United Kingdom supports new permanent seats for Brazil, Germany, India and Japan, alongside permanent African representation. We also support an expansion in the number of non-permanent seats.

As others have said, next year we will celebrate the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations and the tenth anniversary of the Summit Outcome. Let us mark those occasions with genuine action on reform.

Disagreement around whether or not to extend the veto right has proved one of the key obstacles to making any progress on Security Council reform. A priority for all of us must be to ensure that any reform does not reduce the Council's capacity to effectively deal with threats to international peace and security. In

that context, the United Kingdom does not support the extension of veto rights to new permanent members. We note with interest the French initiative for voluntary Permanent Five veto restraint and welcome the valuable debate it has sparked. We have been appalled by the cynical way in which the veto has been used since 2011 to enable the perpetuation of mass atrocities and war crimes by the Syrian regime. We cannot envisage circumstances in which the United Kingdom would use its veto to block an appropriate response to a mass atrocity or other major crisis. But to be meaningful, this initiative would, of course, require the united support of all the permanent members of the Council.

It is important that arguments on contentious issues such as the veto be heard, but we also need to be careful to ensure that the range of different and opposing views around the veto do not distract us from the important task of broadening the membership of the Council to ensure that it is a better reflection of the modern world.

Let me finish by reaffirming the United Kingdom's commitment to improving the Security Council's working methods. Improving the Council's effectiveness must go hand in hand with any discussion on increasing its size. The United Kingdom works hard to ensure that the Council is continually looking at new ways to improve its efficiency, effectiveness and transparency, including through the use of technological advancements. We are always open to new practical suggestions for improvement and welcome the constructive spirit in which the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group has engaged in discussions on the Council's working methods.

**Ms. Chan** (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica welcomes the convening of this meeting of the General Assembly on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters.

My delegation welcomes also the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. We also express our deep appreciation to Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, for his work.

We reiterate our commitment to continuing to work with members most seriously in this process, which should be guided by the fundamental principles governing the Organization, and promoting first and foremost the strengthening of multilateralism.

Costa Rica has participated in every round of intergovernmental negotiations, providing clear arguments and specific proposals concerning the reasons underlying its principled position. Our objective has been this: to achieve an in-depth, comprehensive and inclusive reform of the Security Council, one that is anchored in the principle of the sovereign equality of States and the criteria of legitimacy, representativeness, effectiveness and transparency.

Democratic reform can be achieved only through a commitment to compromise and through a constructive and flexible spirit among Member States. It is for that reason that Costa Rica shares the concerns and suggestions expressed by the representative of Italy on behalf of the Uniting for Consensus group.

Throughout the 10 rounds of intergovernmental negotiations, Costa Rica has explained why it is firmly opposed to the creation of new permanent seats and any extension of the veto or any other prerogative in the Security Council. Costa Rica believes that no reform of the Security Council can be effective, legitimate or democratic if it consists merely in extending the privileges that a few currently enjoy and adding permanent seats for others.

My country has therefore argued that careful expansion of the non-permanent membership category, with the option of some keeping their the seat for more than two consecutive years, is the only way of achieving a more representative and legitimate body — a body in which can be heard the revitalizing voices and worldviews of Africa, the Asia-Pacific region and Latin America and the Caribbean, whose readiness to play an active role in the context of the items currently before the Security Council will also contribute to ensuring greater accountability on the part of non-permanent members.

This geometry of transformed representation will also make it possible to significantly increase the chances for election to the Council, which would benefit above all smaller countries such as my own, which constitute a majority of the Organization's Members. The goal is to increase the real possibilities for the entire membership, not to limit them further.

A profound improvement in working methods will also serve to consolidate those real possibilities. We know that in a larger Council should be clearer and more predictable, systematic and transparent.



Costa Rica is concerned that the document presented by the advisory group is being put forth as a tool to help structure the intergovernmental negotiations, when in effect it is a summary of some but not all the proposals for the negotiation process. My country believes that the advisory group document cannot and should not be the basis for guiding our work. The intergovernmental negotiations and the texts that we have worked on together as a body of 193 countries enjoy precedence and absolute legitimacy over any other process or parallel text. The only document that can claim the support of the entire membership is the second revised document.

The solution does not lie in presenting partial proposals for reform outside the intergovernmental negotiations process. That will only further divide the membership and delay the possibility of comprehensive Security Council reform. Let us comply with the content of decision 62/557 and, in good faith and in an open and transparent manner, negotiate a comprehensive reform of the Council that takes into account the five main themes contained in the proposals of Member States, in order to arrive at the broadest possible political agreement.

Costa Rica reiterates its readiness to participate in any and all consultations that the presidency deems necessary, and to collaborate in a constructive, actively engaged spirit in the design of a process that allows us to move forward at this defining moment for the future of the Organization — a process that should lead to Security Council reform for all, not only for a few.

**Mr. Oh Joon** (Republic of Korea): I would like to express my gratitude to you, Mr. President, for convening this timely meeting. Security Council reform has great importance for the Council's functioning and for the future of the United Nations. We appreciate your initiative to work for common ground on that agenda, in close consultation with the United Nations membership.

The Republic of Korea supports the reform of the Security Council as an important and urgent matter. The Council must be reformed in accordance with the changing geopolitical realities of the world today. At the same time, it is critical to bring about a more representative, accountable, democratic and efficient Security Council. The only plausible way to achieve that is by holding periodic elections. An expansion of the number of elected members would bring a better balance to the Council, thereby improving its work. Accountability through elections is fundamental

to our Governments, parliaments and multilateral organizations; the same principle should apply to the Security Council. A single election that allows a handful of countries to remain on the Council indefinitely runs counter to the principles of democracy and accountability. More importantly, it will not enable the Council to better reflect changing international political realities in order to effectively address global challenges.

The Uniting for Consensus group, to which the Republic of Korea belongs, has shown flexibility in its proposals for Security Council reform. We would like to see progress in the negotiations. The group's suggestion of longer-term re-electable seats could serve as a viable compromise solution. We look forward to seeing other negotiating groups take a constructive approach to move the agenda forward. With regard to the matter of procedure, one lesson we can draw from previous negotiations is that any reform formula must enjoy the widest possible support of Member States. We need to strive for consensus, as stipulated in decision 62/557, to address that critical matter.

Security Council reform must also be addressed in a comprehensive manner encompassing all five key areas. The Republic of Korea looks forward to making progress in the negotiations on reforming the Council under your leadership, Mr. President, as well as that of Ambassador Courtney Rattray, the newly appointed facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations, whom we assure of our full cooperation. We also thank Ambassador Tanin, the first facilitator, for his untiring efforts to move the negotiations forward. We will continue to work closely with other Member States on this important task.

**Mr. Yoshikawa** (Japan): I would like to start by thanking you, Mr. President, for your leadership since you assumed the post of President in September, in steering the important agenda items before us, which include the reform of the Security Council.

Allow me to associate myself fully with the statement delivered earlier by Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota of Brazil on behalf of the Group of Four (G4). I would also like to congratulate Ambassador Courtney Rattray of Jamaica as the new Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. Ambassador Rattray has already shown his superb ability to build consensus as Chair of the First Committee. I extend full support and cooperation to the new Chair.

My special gratitude goes to the former President of the General Assembly, Ambassador John Ashe, and to the former Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations, Ambassador Zahir Tahin of Afghanistan. In particular, Ambassador Tanin worked tirelessly as chair over the past six years to move the process forward. The third revised document, issued in 2011, and his assessment of the intergovernmental negotiations process issued in July are among his important legacies.

As pointed out by many speakers before me, with the approach of the seventieth anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations we are facing an enormous opportunity. Next September will also mark 50 years since the Security Council was reformed for the first and only time. All of us here remember the call from our leaders at the 2005 World Summit for early reform of the Security Council. I believe that now is the time to move forward to fulfil the mandate given by our leaders at that Summit.

We are all aware that 50 years ago, when the Council was expanded, the membership of the United Nations was 117 countries. Today, we are 193. Despite the addition of 76 countries, the membership of the Security Council remains the same. The Council should reflect the geopolitical realities of the twenty-first century by expanding both permanent and non-permanent membership. I strongly believe that more countries, most notably those of Africa and the Asia-Pacific, should be on the Council.

I attach great importance to the intergovernmental negotiations. They provide the only forum where all Member countries can negotiate for their shared goal of Security Council reform. The non-paper of the advisory group of former President John Ashe, as well as the former Chair's assessment, generated positive momentum for the negotiations. Despite all the efforts made so far, however, we must admit that discussions are still at a stalemate. We cannot afford for business as usual to continue in 2015. Let us not make our negotiations an endless exercise.

In order to launch real negotiations under the leadership of the President and the new Chair, we must work on the basis of a negotiation text. I was pleased, Sir, that your letter of 10 November encouraged Member States to move the process to text-based negotiations. In September here in New York, the G-4 Foreign Ministers decided to reach out to Member States to discuss models for an enlarged Security Council. I believe that that outreach will generate positive momentum for

producing a negotiating text and that it will revitalize discussion of the intergovernmental negotiations.

Before closing, let me refer to the question of the veto, which is one of the most difficult issues to address when discussing Security Council reform. We have seen an initiative proposed by France to refrain from using the veto in situations of mass atrocities. We welcome the French proposal. Its significance lies in the fact that a permanent member of the Council made a proposal to limit the use of veto power. Japan hopes that other permanent members will join the French initiative.

To conclude, allow me to reiterate Japan's firm support for you, Sir. Japan is resolved to continue cooperating with you on this crucial issue at this critical moment in time.

**Mr. Wang Min** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation wishes to thank you, Sir, for convening today's meeting. We welcome your appointment of the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, Ambassador Rattray, as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Tanin of Afghanistan for his efforts over the past five years as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. We support Ambassador Rattray in his efforts to carry out work in accordance with his mandate and in a constructive manner by adhering to a position of impartiality, objectivity and fairness, and to play a bridging role among members of the General Assembly and to better serve the Member States.

Recent years have witnessed fundamental and significant changes in international situations and an increase in global threats and challenges to humankind. Member States are placing greater expectations on the Security Council. The Security Council is entrusted with the important responsibility of maintaining international peace and security and is fulfilling that responsibility on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations. The Council's authority and efficiency are intrinsically linked to the 193 Member States. Reasonable and necessary Council reform will help it to better fulfil the sacred responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter of the United Nations and to better serve humankind's cause of peace and development.

China has always actively supported Security Council reform and believes that it should start with and be based on giving priority to increasing the representation and voice of developing countries,

especially those of Africa. At the same time, it should allow more countries, especially the small and medium-sized countries that make up the majority of the United Nations membership, to have greater opportunities to serve the Council, participate in its decision-making and play a greater role in effectively upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter and the guiding principles that govern international relations.

Reform of the Council involves the future of the United Nations and the immediate interests of all the Member States. Promoting progress in the reform process will require Member States to undertake extensive consultations and accommodate the interests and needs of all parties, especially those of the small and medium-sized countries, so as to achieve the broadest possible consensus.

China believes that it is necessary to abide by a number of key principles.

First is the principle of unity. The General Assembly is playing a transitional role at this session by undertaking the historical mission and unique task of summarizing the experience of the past and exploring new ways and means to move ahead into the future. Unity should be the key word at this session. Reform of the United Nations in all areas, including reform of the Security Council, cannot make headway amid disputes, accusations or serious confrontation. All Member States should focus on unity with a view to strengthening the authority and effectiveness of the Council and increasing the representation of developing countries therein. It is important to ensure that reform is a process to iron out differences and strengthen unity. Any unfair treatment of the position of Member States, artificial deadlines for reform or, worse, the forceful imposition of immature reform formulas will only exacerbate the disputes and division among the Member States, deflect reform from its correct direction and undermine the common interests of all Member States and the long-term interests of the United Nations.

The second principle is that of ownership of the Member States. Reform of the Council touches on the direct interests of each and every Member State, and the process should and must be owned and guided by them. Intergovernmental negotiations should be carried out only on the basis of the positions and proposals of Member States, should treat the proposals of all sides equally, and accommodate their interests and concerns in pursuit of the broadest possible consensus. That is the

only scenario that can ensure the correct direction of the reform process and guarantee its healthy development. The arbitrary reduction of the options for negotiations and a rush into text-based negotiations without the consensus of Member States would only exacerbate the division and discord and make the reform process more difficult. That is contrary to the expectations of Member States.

Third is the principle of democratic consultations. There is still a lack of consensus among Member States on such matters as the basic concept of reform. With respect to either the categories of increased membership or the scope of the Council, all Member States have their own proposals, and positions and there is a serious divergence of views. However, the more divergent the views, the more necessary it is for Member States to carry out patient consultations aimed at consensus. We should turn differences of opinion into the driving force and put our heads together as we seek consensus and try to reach a package deal on the questions related to reform.

Only a solution reached through in-depth consultations among all Member States and supported by the majority will be acceptable to the United Nations membership. Only a decision jointly made by Member States will be able to stand the test of time. Reform of the Security Council is a thorny and tough issue of United Nations reform in all fields. The key to achieving progress in reform is in the hands of Member States. Only when they rise above their differences, make compromises and accommodate each other's concerns will it be possible for reform to move ahead on the correct track.

China hopes that Member States will continue at this session to abide by decision 62/557 and conduct the intergovernmental negotiations in an open, inclusive and transparent manner. China will continue to work together with other countries to arrive at a reform formula that will enjoy the widest possible consensus among Member States and conform to the long-term interests of the United Nations and the common interests of its Members.

**Mr. Sinhaseni** (Thailand): Next year will mark the tenth anniversary of the World Summit, at which our leaders called for early reform of the Security Council. It will also mark the fiftieth anniversary of the entry into force, on 31 August 1965, of the amendment to the Charter of the United Nations that led to the expansion

of the Security Council from 11 to 15, with an increase in non-permanent members from 6 to 10. As we all know, that amendment was made in response to an increase in the United Nations membership from 51 in 1945 to 115 in 1963. Today, there are 193 Members, and it is possible that the number will increase.

With the large increase in the membership and the tremendous changes in the global geopolitical and geo-economic landscape since the inception of the United Nations in 1945, we have all agreed to the reform of the Council in five areas, as mandated by decision 62/557 of 2008, to bring the Council into line with present-day reality. After two decades of negotiations, first under the Ad Hoc Working Group and later under the intergovernmental negotiation process, we should be in a position to reach consensus on all these five areas.

With respect to the categories of membership, there is no objection to the expansion of non-permanent members. However, different views remain on the expansion of the number of permanent members. On the question of the veto, there appears to be growing support for the so-called code of conduct proposed by France, instead of an outright abolition of the veto, which is highly unlikely, if not impossible. On regional representation, there is a clear consensus on equitable regional representation. Concerning the size of an enlarged Security Council, there seems to be a convergence of views that an enlarged Council should be in the mid-twenties. With regard to improving the working methods of the Council, there is no objection to improvement of the working methods either before or after reform. In fact, improving the Council's working methods should be an ongoing process that is not held hostage to overall reform of the Council. On the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly, I believe that we all agree that those two principal organs of the United Nations should work in unison in accordance with their respective mandates, as given in the Charter.

The only issue that seems to be holding back the much-needed reform of the Security Council is the expansion of the permanent membership. On that issue, Thailand has always been open to all ideas or proposals, including the expansion of both categories of membership or the introduction of so-called interim or intermediate options. We share the view of a number of Member States that reform will be possible only if Member States are willing to be more flexible and

prepared to engage in give-and-take negotiations. We are also receptive to the proposal of holding a text-based negotiation. However, before we embark upon drafting any text, all must first agree on the principles for a possible way forward, especially on the most important issue of increasing the number of permanent members.

In our view, it will be very difficult to reach consensus on an increase in the number of permanent members, at least in the immediate future, due to the firm opposition of certain Member States that are skeptical of the need to add more permanent seats to the Council. However, that does not mean that such an expansion will be not possible in the long term. Countries that wish to become new permanent members must prove that they have both the capacity and the commitment to strengthening the Council, while the wider membership, on the other hand, should have the right to evaluate whether the addition of new permanent members has any proven merit. Unlike the current five permanent members, which were given permanent seats because of their historical contribution to bringing an end to the Second World War and subsequently establishing a new international organization known today as the United Nations, the new members should be given permanent seats if they can clearly demonstrate their capacity and commitment to maintaining international peace and security. More importantly, the expansion of the permanent membership must prove to be useful in enhancing the Council's efficiency and effectiveness.

In order to give the aspiring permanent members the opportunity to demonstrate their capacity and commitment, an interim category of membership should be introduced to allow them to serve on the Council for three to five years, based on conditions and criteria to be established. If they are re-elected for a second term, there could then be a review during or after the second term on the possible expansion of the permanent membership. However, the introduction of such interim seats should not affect the expansion of non-permanent members based on the principle of equitable regional representation.

As we will soon mark the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations and the tenth anniversary of the World Summit, Member States need to work together in the spirit of compromise and flexibility to ensure that the forthcoming eleventh round of negotiations in the context of the intergovernmental negotiations will produce tangible results and lead to progress. Let me join other speakers in thanking and paying tribute to



Ambassador Zahir Tanin of Afghanistan for his tireless efforts and the tremendous patience he showed during his six years as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations. I would also like to warmly congratulate Ambassador Courtney Rattray of Jamaica on his recent appointment as the new intergovernmental negotiations Chair. My delegation has full confidence in Ambassador Rattray and wishes him well in his work.

We need a fresh approach and many new ideas and proposals to move the reform forward. The repetition of known positions leads nowhere. The ideas Thailand has put forward today are all aimed at breaking the deadlock by taking on board all the concerns and proposals of all sides that are either for or against the expansion of the number of permanent seats. Only when that deadlock is broken can we finally achieve a much-needed reform of the Security Council that is acceptable to all.

**Mr. Deniau** (France) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I should like to welcome the appointment of Ambassador Rattray of Jamaica as facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. We wish him every success in his mission.

Discussions on Security Council reform in the General Assembly have been going on for almost two decades now, and we are compelled to note that we have made no progress on the issue. Ambassador Tanin of Afghanistan, to whose work I pay tribute, tried to offer Member States a concise and concrete document on possible modalities for reform, but no agreement was reached to advance specifically on the path to expansion of the Council.

And yet the discussions at the sixty-eighth session within the framework of intergovernmental negotiations showed that a majority of Members of the Organization wanted reform. The practical arrangements remain to be specified, clearly, but it is a significant step forward, and we now need to move to negotiations based on a text, as has been emphasized today by the representatives of Guyana, Brazil, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone and India.

France believes that the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the Organization should be utilized to bring the Member States to agreement on an ambitious reform project. My country hopes that a text will be circulated to allow concrete negotiation with a view to expanding the Security Council in both categories of membership. Such reform is critical. The Security Council must better reflect the realities of today's

world while strengthening its capacity to fully assume its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

France desires the Council to take into account the emergence of new Powers that are willing and able to take responsibility for a permanent seat in the Security Council and are, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, up to the task of making a significant contribution to the action of the Council. In this respect, it supports the candidacies of Germany, Brazil, India and Japan as permanent members of the Security Council, as well as an increased presence of African countries among the permanent and non-permanent members.

I take this opportunity to remind the Assembly of the French initiative on voluntary regulation of the use of the veto. The ministerial meeting of 25 September on the veto, co-chaired by the Foreign Ministers of France and Mexico, showed that many Member States as well as civil society support this initiative, in which, I recall, the five permanent members of the Security Council would refrain voluntarily and collectively from using the veto when a situation of mass atrocities has arisen. This voluntary approach, as several speakers have noted today, does not require a revision of the Charter. The discussions on the practicalities of implementation are continuing with our partners, and France hopes to reach agreement with the other permanent members of the Security Council in the coming months. We will continue in parallel to mobilize its supporters in order to maintain the momentum already operative.

Finally, I would remind the Assembly that our initiative on the veto is distinct and complementary to the comprehensive reform of the Council, which is a reform for which France will continue to advocate.

**Mr. Boukadoum** (Algeria): Mr. President, I would like to thank you for convening today's debate on agenda item 119, entitled "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters". My country follows this issue of utmost importance. Naturally, my delegation greatly appreciates your opening remarks.

I would also like to congratulate Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, Permanent Representative of Jamaica, on his appointment as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform and express our commitment to working with him to ensure comprehensive reform of the Council.

I would also like to express our deep appreciation for the great efforts undertaken by the previous Chair, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, in previous sessions.

Algeria fully aligns itself with the statements delivered by the representatives of Iran and Kuwait on behalf of the Non-Alignment Movement and the Group of Arab States, respectively. I now would like, on instructions from my Government, to add the following remarks.

With regard to the reform of the Security Council, I reiterate Algeria's commitment to this very important issue and state that we look forward to building on what was achieved during the past session on the basis of General Assembly decision 62/557. We are heartened that during the general debate in the Assembly's current session, many Heads of State and Government and heads of delegation, including my own Foreign Minister, reaffirmed the need to reform the Security Council in order to make it more representative, democratic and legitimate. We must now all continue to seek the goal of reaching an agreement on a reform model that takes into account the core values of the United Nations, specifically inclusiveness, democracy, accountability, equality and transparency.

Correcting the present imbalance in the composition of the Council with a view to transforming it into a more legitimate organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security remains the collective responsibility of all Member States and the main objective of the General Assembly. We hope that at this session the pace will increase for a more frank and lively debate — one that is more flexible, willing to strike compromises and decisive — generating the necessary political will that would lead to such a reform, in accordance with the vision of our leaders expressed at the 2005 World Summit.

Algeria is a member of the African Union Committee of Ten. On that basis, Algeria actively takes part in the promotion of the African common position and continues to engage in the intergovernmental negotiations aimed at correcting the historical injustice suffered by Africa as the only continent not represented in the Security Council's permanent membership and underrepresented in the non-permanent category. To that end, we urge the wider United Nations membership to work with Africa to address this injustice with insistence. We are committed to building alliances in support of the African common position with

diverse interest groups and Member States engaged in intergovernmental negotiations with a view to achieving reform of the Council.

Africa's position is a continental aspiration, with which we believe all Member States and other stakeholders are now very familiar. In that regard, it is important to recall that in 1945, when the United Nations was created, most of Africa was not represented, and when the first reform took place in 1963 Africa was represented but at the time not considered for inclusion in the permanent category. Circumstances have changed since then, and it would merely be a question of simple justice for Africa to be fully represented in all decision-making organs of the United Nations, particularly in the Security Council. Full representation of Africa in the Council, according to the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration, means, first, acquiring no fewer than two permanent seats, with all the prerogatives and privileges of permanent membership, including the right of veto if it continues to exist. Secondly, Africa is laying claim to five non-permanent seats.

We note with concern the lack of progress and concrete results during the ten rounds of the General Assembly's intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform. Despite that fact, and in the spirit of our commitment to addressing the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and other related matters, Algeria is ready to continue to engage constructively and in good faith in the intergovernmental negotiations process during the current session of General Assembly.

We also note that in your letter of 10 November, Mr. President, you encourage Member States to move the process to text-based negotiations. In that case, my delegation still considers the second revision of the compiled text a good basis for negotiations. However, there is a need for general agreement on what to do during the current session, and this debate could help the Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations further clarify his intentions on how to proceed. Security Council reform should be addressed in a comprehensive, transparent and balanced manner.

In conclusion, I would like to assure you, Mr. President, of our full support and cooperation in making more progress on reforming the Security Council under your leadership.

**Mr. González de Linares Palou** (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would first like to thank you, Mr. President, for the interest you have shown in working closely with all the States Members of the United Nations on the issue of Security Council reform.

We congratulate Ambassador Rattray warmly on his appointment and wish him every success in his important task. He can count on Spain's full support. I would also like to express our deep gratitude to his predecessor, Ambassador Tanin, for his work, tireless efforts and patience during his term.

We subscribe fully to the statement delivered on behalf of Uniting for Consensus by the Permanent Representative of Italy and would like to make a few additional remarks.

After working for a long time on the process of reforming the Security Council — in my case, since 1993 — my country has learned that our strength comes from unity, while divisive approaches and actions only cause delays and complicate reform even further. As States Members of the United Nations, we all share the goal of creating a more representative, accountable, effective and democratic Security Council, and to achieve it we must be willing to consider new ideas and build bridges between the various groups and positions. The Security Council reform process resembles the construction of a big building. It needs a good, solid foundation. If it uses only part of that foundation, the building cannot be built, and if it is built, it will collapse.

We are eager to see a modern version of the Security Council that is more representative and influential, and in particular a place where African and small States can make their voices heard. Spain believes that increasing the Council's membership will help it be more representative, but much more than that is needed. It is also essential that we increase every Member State's chances of having a seat on the Council from time to time. And the best way to achieve that goal is by increasing the number of elected seats, which would also make the Security Council more democratic and accountable to all the Member States of this Organization. That does not mean that new permanent seats should be created, since we believe that will not make the Council more representative. On the contrary, we would be creating a more exclusive Council rather than a more inclusive one, turning our backs on the need for greater democracy and accountability in the Council.

We need a more accountable and effective Council. Those features go hand in hand. Spain supports the idea of allowing Member States that wish to make a significant contribution to the Council's work to serve on it more often and for longer periods of time. Spain believes in a Security Council that is based on merit, not privilege. My country supports the Uniting for Consensus proposal to create seats for longer terms with the possibility of immediate re-election. That formula, we believe, would enable States with the desire and ability to contribute more to the Council's work to extend their service on it.

In conclusion, Spain wishes to reiterate its willingness to collaborate with other groups and States Members of the United Nations to reach the best possible solution for achieving a more representative, accountable, effective and democratic Security Council.

**Mr. Estreme** (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation, I would first like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting.

I would like to express Argentina's support for the statement delivered by the representative of Italy on behalf of Uniting for Consensus. I would also like to offer our thanks to Ambassador Zahir Tanin of Afghanistan for his work in the past few years leading the intergovernmental negotiations, and to warmly welcome and congratulate Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica on his appointment to the position. He can count on the Argentine delegation's full cooperation and constructive efforts in his work as Chair of the intergovernmental negotiations.

As others have pointed out, the process of the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform has been framed by the content of resolutions 48/26 and 53/30 and decision 62/557. The discussions have enabled us to exhaustively analyse the five main issues: membership categories, the veto question, regional representation, the size and working methods of an expanded Security Council, and the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly. Those issues are interrelated and cannot be tackled separately, since they are all parts of a single package.

The areas of convergence are well known. The first, clearest and most basic is the absolute necessity of reforming the Security Council and ending the status quo. An unreformed Council is obsolete. Its loss of legitimacy, effectiveness and relevance affects the entire Organization. There are other areas of convergence,

of course, with the Council's working methods being a clear example that we must work to improve and make more transparent. Another is the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly. And to a lesser extent, there is also convergence on the number of members on an expanded Council. But none of those three areas presents differences that are insoluble or insurmountable. At the same time, the intergovernmental negotiations process has identified other aspects on which we have divergent positions, in particular on the membership categories and the issue of the veto.

With respect to the first issue — the categories of membership — my country believes that the reform should not allow for new permanent members or create exclusive categories. We are of the view that this type of seat, that is to say permanent seats, does not necessarily guarantee greater participation by those who at present are not represented in the Council. At the same time, we believe that any formula must include the concept of a legitimate democratic and representative process, with elections as a fundamental element.

The phase now beginning is positive. It will enable us to pragmatically and rationally explore the possibilities afforded us by the so-called intermediary solution. In so doing, we will achieve a compromise that satisfies all Member States, respecting the principles of transparency, good faith, mutual respect, openness and inclusiveness.

With regard to the issue of the veto, since the 1945 negotiations at the San Francisco Conference and with greater emphasis at the first session of the General Assembly, in October 1946, and the second session, in 1947, Argentina established a very firm position against the veto. There is no doubt as to our position. In the years that followed, my delegation reiterated that same position repeatedly. But at the same time, we believe that, given the fact that eliminating the veto is not possible at this point, formulas that would seek to perpetuate it or extend it to new members should not be accepted.

We must reach a comprehensive solution, not by phases or in an incomplete manner. As I said earlier, all the issues are linked and cannot be dealt with separately. We all know that in any negotiating process, intransigent positions do not lead to any result. We have the opportunity to overcome the impasse and the lack of progress. We call on all delegations to follow

the example of Uniting for Consensus, as expressed by the representative of Italy this morning, to show flexibility and readiness to work on innovative and consistent formulas that will ensure a more democratic presence in the Council, based on rotation among the non-permanent members, and to reformulate the working methods so that the Council can be more democratic, fair and transparent.

In closing, my delegation wishes to once again reiterate the Argentine Government's intention to compromise, to remain open to any approach that can bring positions closer together and that can bring about the much-needed reform of the Security Council. My country is confident that under your leadership, Mr. President, and that of Ambassador Rattray, we can take the first steps on the path to agreement.

**Mr. Alday González (Mexico)** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this debate on the reform of the Security Council and for your decision to separate this discussion from that on the Council's annual report to the General Assembly. They are issues that deserve their own space and separate discussions.

My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Italy on behalf of Uniting for Consensus.

My delegation welcomes the new facilitator of the intergovernmental negotiations, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, and extends to him its support and willingness to work towards our common goal — an outcome that is acceptable to all. We also thank Ambassador Tanin for his leadership in this process over the past five years.

Over 20 years of discussions, we have found that the most important quality for a facilitator on this issue is the ability to listen to the positions of Member States with impartiality, transparency and objectivity, and on that basis determine the way that will allow for agreement to be reached on a solution that has the widest possible support. The facilitator also needs flexibility on the part of States to move towards that common goal. Without flexibility or willingness to compromise, the facilitator's room to manoeuvre is reduced to a minimum. In such a scenario, we cannot wait for the person directing the process to interpret the various positions or, worse, discard or minimize proposals submitted by delegations.

Listening to the Member States does not mean seeking to impose summary documents with artificial



timetables. The document length does not determine delegations' level of flexibility, and imposing a timetable fosters distrust, generates larger divisions and focuses our discussions on the form and not the substance of this debate. Security Council reform is a process that can be guided only by all Member States, and not just a few. It is a process that, in order to move forward, must start from common positions. The second revision of the document and the expansion of the number of non-permanent Council members are the only elements that, after 20 years of discussions, all Member States have been able to agree on, and therefore they constitute two pillars on the basis of which to resume our negotiations with flexibility and without assuming an outcome that has been pre-designed to favour a few Member States.

Security Council reform is also an urgent process. Council inaction in recent crises has had significant consequences. It is a paralysis that often prevents it from responding in a timely and effectively manner, and we must correct that. That is why France and Mexico convened and co-hosted a discussion during the high-level week of the sixty-ninth session on restricting the use of the veto in situations of war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide. That initiative is a step in the right direction and provides the five permanent members the opportunity to renew their commitment to the primary responsibility of the Council — the maintenance of international peace and security.

Throughout the negotiations process, Uniting for Consensus has reviewed and outlined reform models that can meet the expectations of the majority of Member States. Uniting for Consensus has focused on listening to the voices and taking into account the interests of small States, including small island and developing countries, which have faced enormous challenges to date in seeking to be elected as members of the Council. We are also sensitive to the expectations of those States aspiring to play a more important role in maintaining international peace and security.

Mexico and Uniting for Consensus do not seek to impose their vision on the rest of the membership. We want to achieve a compromise with which the highest number of Member States can identify. We oppose permanence and therefore promote a clear and simple proposal, with additional seats allocated on the basis of the principle of equitable geographical representation and mandates longer than the current two years, with the possibility of immediate re-election.

Mexico conceives of a Security Council with 26 members, where, in addition to the five permanent members, there are six countries from Africa, five from Asia, four from the Latin American and Caribbean Group, three from the Group of Western European and other States, two from the Group of Eastern European States and one small island developing State or other small State. We believe that this proposal and its details with respect to election of regular members and those with broader mandates, the decision-making processes in the Council, the various perspectives on working methods, and the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly would reconcile the aspirations of all parties while, on the one hand, adjusting the composition of the Council to new regional realities and, on the other, securing a broader presence than usual for those States willing to serve more frequently on the Council. This model provides a sufficient margin of action to negotiate and ensure appropriate regional representation for all underrepresented groups while also preserving the principles of transparency and accountability.

As Latin Americans, we understand perfectly the aspirations of the African Group to equitable representation that would allow it to play its rightful role in the Council. We conceive of their legitimate claim as an expression of the strength that gives them unity and consensus, and not as an individual aspiration to power and privilege.

As we begin a new cycle in the process of negotiations, Mexico would reiterate the five core principles or criteria that have regulated and will continue to guide our participation in this process: first, to improve the representativeness of the Security Council by adding new elected members on the basis of equitable geographical distribution while preserving the accountability of these members through regular elections; secondly, improve balance in the Council's decision-making process through a prolonged presence of elected members; thirdly, improve the access of all States to the Security Council through an appropriate expansion while preserving its efficiency; fourthly, improve the Council's effectiveness by promoting measures to limit the use of the veto by the permanent members; and fifthly, improve the Council's transparency by reforming its working methods and its relationship with the General Assembly. Accordingly, Mexico supports the proposals of the Accountability,

Coherence and Transparency Group on those topics and considers them to be an excellent point of departure.

We commend you, Mr. President, in considering and being guided by these premises to revive the current process in the interest of achieving the reform that we all hope for. The reform of the Security Council will not be achieved if new privileges are granted in perpetuity to some States in order to meet national ambitions. Undoubtedly, a new Security Council should be based on merit and not on privilege. We are confident that, in the full awareness of the divergent positions on this matter, your able leadership, Sir, and that of the facilitator will guide us to the compromise solution that we all hope for. Both nationally and in the Uniting for Consensus movement, Mexico will maintain its active and constructive participation with openness and absolute transparency.

**Mr. Ruiz** (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin, Sir, by thanking you for calling for an extension of the intergovernmental negotiation process in a constructive manner.

I align myself with the statement made by Ambassador Cardi on behalf of the Uniting for Consensus Group.

I wish to thank Ambassador Tanin for his dedication over the past five years and welcome Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica as our new facilitator, as he is from a country of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States. Familiar as we are with his proven diplomatic abilities, we are confident that his input and impartiality will safeguard the transparency of the process.

As we all know, the intergovernmental negotiations process has gone on much longer than we would have wished, but that does not mean it is any less constructive, as it has enabled us to participate in a dialogue in which we have been able to know fully the positions of the other groups. In that regard, my delegation believes that it is pertinent to highlight that over the 10 rounds of negotiations so far, it has become clear that constructive engagement of the various groups and the need to show flexibility are the cornerstones for progress in the process and for the achievement of concrete outcomes.

To get there, and recognizing the difficulties inherent in reforming the Security Council, we believe it timely to explore the possibilities of ensuring that the process will be more agile, allowing for better

exchange of ideas and leading thereby to progress. All of that would be undertaken with respect for and in the framework of the clear provisions set out in decision 62/557. Colombia supports the intergovernmental negotiations process based on the 2009 consensus, which are reflected in the provisions of that decision.

In view of the foregoing, we take this opportunity to invite all delegations and groups to show flexibility and openness in order to engage in an inclusive process and reach a democratic consensus. I should also say that inclusiveness and democratic consensus are the two pillars upon which Colombia's position of principle on the reform process is based. We also firmly believe in the sovereign equality of States. Since the San Francisco Conference at which the Organization was founded, and through each of the 25 representatives who have led the Colombian delegation to date, as well as the seven opportunities we have had to serve in the Security Council, Colombia has always called for the Council to be more representative, accountable and transparent.

However, as we all know, the world in which the United Nations was born in 1945 is very different from that of today, and the historical and geopolitical conditions in which the only reform that has been possible to date, which took place 51 years ago, have changed beyond recognition. That is why we have to ask ourselves whether the proposals on the negotiating table are the best way forward for the maintenance of international peace and security, given the challenges posed by unprecedented humanitarian crises, transborder criminal networks and terrorism, as well as the need for peacekeeping operations to evolve and be more effective. Are these the discussions that can lead to the establishment of a Security Council that is adapted to the new realities?

As far as my country is concerned, we must have comprehensive, transparent, balanced and equitable negotiations that reflect the needs and interests of all Member States, especially developing countries, which cannot continue to be underrepresented in the Security Council. We must recognize that through the reform process we must create more space and opportunities to ensure the participation of all States on an equal footing, without any privileges for just a few.

In closing, I wish to reiterate the readiness of my delegation to continue to work towards a reform that would endow the Organization with a Security Council

that is legitimate, inclusive and guided by democratic principles.

**Mr. Akinterinwa** (Nigeria): Mr. President, we recall that on your election on 11 June 2014 you remarked that the intergovernmental negotiations on Security Council reform had not made the desired progress and you assured us that you would work with Member States to make further progress on this important issue (see A/68/PV.93). My delegation therefore especially commends you for convening this meeting and for your determination to move the process forward during the Assembly's sixty-ninth session. We should also recall, Mr. President, that during your address at the start of the session on 16 September (see A/69/PV.1), you stated that one of your priorities would be a continued focus on Security Council reform, and you stressed the urgency of the need for that reform, based on the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). Today's meeting and other steps you have taken in this direction are indeed practical demonstrations of your firm commitment to the process.

My delegation aligns itself with the statements delivered by Ambassador Vandi Minah, the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone, and Ambassador Menissa Rambally, the Permanent Representative of Saint Lucia, on behalf, respectively, of the African Group on the common African position, and the L.69 Group.

We commend Ambassador Tanin of Afghanistan on his exemplary leadership of the past 10 rounds of the intergovernmental negotiations, and welcome the appointment of Ambassador Courtenay Rattray, the Permanent Representative of Jamaica, as Chair of the eleventh round. We would like to assure him of our cooperation. It is our sincere hope that this round will advance the discussions to a new level and will not end the way previous rounds of negotiations have.

The reform of the Security Council is inspired by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The clear objective of the process is based on the sovereign equality of all Member States and on the importance of adhering to the principles of democratization and inclusiveness in the United Nations. It is nevertheless a paradox that our past efforts to move the process of negotiation on the subject to a text-based stage have been hampered by a lack of consensus, making the annual rounds of negotiations a mere academic exercise, with no real results achieved.

It is now 10 years since the 2005 World Summit, when leaders collectively called for speedy reform of the Council. We should therefore have a progress report, along with a negotiation text, to submit for our leaders' consideration when they meet at the 2015 summit, which will also mark the seventieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations. The outcome of the eleventh round of negotiations should therefore underscore our commitment to reforming the Council, as the relevant resolutions and the inclination of all Member States demand.

As the previous intergovernmental negotiations demonstrated, it is obvious that an overwhelming majority of delegations supports expansion of the Council in both the permanent and non-permanent categories of membership. What is required of us at this juncture is that we move to the stage of real negotiations with the aid of a working document. For that reason, we would like to highlight our expectation that during the eleventh round of negotiations we will ensure that we move to the stage of text-based negotiations. Otherwise there will be no significant departure from our experience in the past 10 rounds.

Nigeria has continued to express its support for advancing the intergovernmental negotiation process in an open, inclusive and transparent manner, and my delegation accordingly calls on all parties to be prepared to display openness and flexibility in order to make concessions that will enable us to find common ground and move the process forward in a progressive manner. We would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm the African common position, as expressed in the Ezulwini Consensus, which we strongly support. We also wish to underscore the overriding importance of ensuring that Africa's interests continue to be advanced and safeguarded during this new process.

The Group of African States supports comprehensive reform of the Security Council, particularly in the area of membership. In that connection, the Group demands two seats in the permanent category and an additional two in the non-permanent category. This is important if we are to correct the historical injustice done to the continent and its marginalization over many years. In addition, Africa advocates that the prerogative of the veto be abolished, but if it must continue to exist, it should be extended to new permanent members as well.

As we look forward to fruitful deliberations and concrete results from the eleventh round of negotiations,

we will continue to count on your leadership, Sir, in steering the process successfully this time to a logical conclusion.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*