



# PAKISTAN

PERMANENT MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

8 EAST 65th STREET – NEW YORK, NY 10021 – (212) 879-8600

## REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR FARUKH AMIL ACTING PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE

MEETING OF THE OPEN ENDED WORKING GROUP ON THE  
QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE  
IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL  
AND OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL  
14 December 2007

Mr. Chairman,

1. We thank you for convening this first meeting of the Open Ended Working Group. This is in accordance with the decision adopted unanimously by the General Assembly on 17 September as contained in the report of the Working Group for the 61<sup>st</sup> Session (A/61/47).
2. As is clear from your letter of 6 December, you have invited us, all the 192 member states, to discuss in this Working Group, both process and substance with regard to the reform of the Security Council. This is also in keeping with the letter and spirit of the same decision of the Assembly that consideration of “all” issues relevant to the question of Security Council reform should continue in the Working Group with the aim of achieving “general agreement” among member states.
3. We also welcome your decision to appoint three co-vice chairs of the Working Group who together with yourself would constitute a “task force”, as you call it. All three of them are respected and distinguished colleagues and we back the trust that you have reposed in them. We shall cooperate and work closely with the task force under your guidance.
4. Pakistan believes that all subsequent discussions led by the task force should take place in the Working Group. This is the forum, which has the mandate and the legitimacy for promoting open, transparent and inclusive consultations and eventually negotiations on Security Council reform. This is the forum that should determine the process and the pace of it. It is also here that we have to discuss and agree on a common basis for negotiations.

5. In our interactions, we have heard different views on the role of the OEWG in this process. This includes some bizarre interpretations of the Assembly's decision of 17 September. However, the central role of the OEWG as reaffirmed in that decision is beyond doubt. Its operative paragraphs a) to f) start and end with the Open Ended Working Group.

6. We cannot therefore accept any attempt to circumvent or undermine the Working Group. Select gatherings and informal meetings organized by Permanent Missions, is their prerogative, and a practice that is understandable. What is not understandable is that any exclusive, unilateral or self-generated group could be allowed to determine a course of action or make proposals on behalf of the rest of the membership. We have learnt with great concern one such meeting called by a member state a few days ago under the banner of "overarching group on intergovernmental negotiations for Security Council reform". That initiative even sought to pre-empt the meeting of today convened by you. On an issue of such vital importance as Security Council reform, the utility of such an approach is all the more suspect and inadvisable. We urge you, Mr. Chairman, to strongly discourage these moves, as they may undermine the process that you intend to launch.

Mr. Chairman,

7. The positions of member states are quite well known. They had the opportunity to interact again and offer their views during the debate of the General Assembly last month. That discussion, together with the important progress achieved last year, provides a sense of where we stand and how should we proceed from this point.

8. Your remarks while concluding the debate on 14 November were lucid and sagacious, and were generally appreciated and welcomed. The seven guiding principles or rules of the road outlined by you provide the framework in which we should carry forward our collective work. We are pleased that you have mentioned and reaffirmed those principles today.

9. We hope that good faith and the commitment to refrain from any steps that could undermine this process would be clearly forthcoming from all sides. Unilateral or pre-emptive moves will destroy the confidence and trust that you are trying to build.

10. Also from your conclusions it was clear that we were not yet at a stage to kick-off intergovernmental negotiations. The basis, framework and modalities for the negotiations have to be agreed in the first place. We agree with you that these consultations should be carried out in the Open Ended Working Group, and that further steps must allow the membership to reach general agreement on all aspects of Security Council reform. Only through such an outcome can we ensure that the interests and

concerns of all sides, especially those who are currently under-represented, will be accommodated, a point also stressed by you on 14 November.

Mr. Chairman,

11. Over the years, the main stumbling block in the way of realizing the reform of the Security Council has been the claim to individual permanent membership by some countries. We are opposed in principle to this unfair and self-centered demand. It runs counter to the very objectives of reform. It is simply unfeasible.

12. On the other side is Africa's position, which is fundamentally different in that it calls for "permanent seats" for the entire region, and not for one or two individual states. No doubt it has earned our respect and understanding. As we have said on previous occasions, the African model of regional representation if applied to all regions could be an approach that may help to evolve agreement on Security Council reform.

13. It is obvious that unity at the regional levels will facilitate an overall agreement. Besides Africa, the Eastern European Group also has a joint demand for at least one more non-permanent seat. And since that seat will be available to all countries of the region, there is unanimity in the group. But if one or two countries of that group were to demand a permanent seat for themselves, the group would also be faced with the same divisiveness as is seen elsewhere.

14. We also have to accommodate the positions of other constituencies and political groups. The Arab states for example have asked for a permanent seat to be occupied on rotation basis. The Islamic countries have legitimate political and security interests to promote and defend in the Security Council. The Organization of the Islamic Conference comprising 57 member states, almost 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the membership of the United Nations, has made clear that any reform that does not provide for adequate representation of the Islamic Ummah in any category of an expanded Security Council will not be acceptable to the Islamic world.

15. That is why we believe the best option is a model based on increase in elected seats allocated to regions with the possibility of re-election and fair rotation, the mechanism and modalities of which may be determined and agreed by the countries of the respective regions. Such a system of regional representation would impart real meaning to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and truly operationalize the accountability of the countries selected to represent their respective regions on the Council. The inbuilt flexibility of this approach will also enable arrangements between different regions to provide for adequate representation of cross-regional groups such as the Arab League and the OIC in an expanded Council. This model will also improve the balance/ratio between the permanent and non-permanent members in favour of the latter.

Mr. Chairman,

16. There are some fundamental questions that confront the membership at this stage. The task force headed by you would obviously need to address them in our consultations in the Working Group.

17. First, what is the “basis” for negotiations?

18. A way forward was provided by the Facilitators Reports in the 61<sup>st</sup> Session. Neither asked to abandon their initial positions, nor to pre-judge the final reform, the member states were invited to consider an intermediate approach as a compromise solution. It was termed as the only feasible option, considering that none of the past proposals had the required support.

19. The current momentum and positive dynamic has been generated by the Facilitators Reports, which were the result of wide consultations with the membership. The problem is that while some member states wish to avail themselves of the momentum they do not want to take along the Facilitators Reports. That is not practicable. If we want to avoid the repetitive discussions of the past, we have to build on the progress achieved through the Facilitators Reports. Under the circumstances, the easiest and perhaps the only way to move forward is to take the intermediate approach as the basis. Otherwise we risk going back to square one.

20. Second, you have asked us to identify concrete elements on negotiables that could form the basis for intergovernmental negotiations. It may not be possible to specify negotiables as concrete elements. That can only be a result of consultations aimed at elaborating or narrowing down options to find common grounds. That process itself would constitute negotiations. If negotiables are to represent all positions, they need to be general and comprehensive. In our view the five key issues or themes of the Report of the Facilitators provide a ready list of negotiables, namely:

- Categories of membership
- The question of the veto
- The question of regional representation
- The size of an enlarged Security Council
- The working methods of the Security Council and the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

21. To these, some specific elements could be added, such as:

- Criteria to determine the number of new seats and the principles and modalities of their distribution to the regions

- Formulas for representation of all stakeholders – small, medium and large states, regional and political groups
- Alternate means to equalize the veto power
- Accountability of the Council to the general membership-review of Council's decisions by the General Assembly
- Effectiveness-implementation of Council's resolutions.
- Review

22. In our view, once we have agreed on the format and conduct of the meetings of the Open Ended Working Group, the Group should start consultations on these negotiables and with the Reports of the Facilitators as the "basis", to consider how the Facilitators' proposal could be transformed into an agreed and appropriate format, which can then serve as the common basis for negotiations. This exercise will have to be carried out in the OEWG and cannot be relegated to any small group elsewhere. All member states particularly small and medium countries have to be engaged on both the process and substance so as to accommodate their positions on all aspects of the reform.

Mr. Chairman,

23. Today is only the starting point. But it is a good start. We need to take the process forward carefully and steadily, always in good faith, shunning any unilateral and pre-emptive moves, and with sustained commitment from all sides to reach the broadest possible agreement. You can rest assured of our support for the success of this process.

\* \* \* \* \*