

Remarks by H.E. Ambassador Maged A. Abdelaziz, the Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt, before the second exchange of the 8th round of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the reform of the Security Council (21 February 2012):The UFC Initiative

- At the outset, I wish to thank you, Ambassador Tanin, for pushing through with your programme of work by dedicating a separate meeting to each of the five initiatives in conformity with your letter of 9 September 2011, giving us a chance today to have an in-depth discussion on the UFC initiative.
- I wish also to thank H.E. the Permanent Representative of Italy for introducing the UFC proposal today.
- I would like also to associate Egypt's remarks with the Statement delivered by the Representative of Sierra Leon on behalf of the African Group, and to make the following additional remarks:
 - **First:** The UFC Members have exerted efforts in organizing meetings in Rome and Mexico aiming at achieving a much needed compromise solution that could garner the widest possible political acceptance, Egypt believes that the most important outcome of the Rome Conference was the reconfirmation by a majority of member states "to correct, first of all, the historical injustice done to the African continent", taking into account that it is subject to 70% of the Council's decisions, but at the same time under-represented in its membership.
 - However, the mere reference to the special case of Africa or expressions of sympathy for the historical injustice the Continent is still suffering from are simply not enough.
 - In this regard, and despite repeated attempts by the G4 to get closer to the African Common Position as enshrined in the Ezulwini Consensus and the Sirte Declaration, we did not see attempts by the UFC to get closer to the African Group. I appreciate the wish of the UFC to coordinate with the C.10.
 - I recall here the consecutive meetings that the G4 and the African Group held in the headquarters of the African Union in 2005 resulting in narrowing down the differences to only the Veto issue, and the meeting held in London in August 2005 and followed by the Abuja Meeting, and we have not seen similar meetings with the UFC.
 - **With regard to the Italy/Colombia proposal, I wish to make the following comments concerning substance:**
 - 1- **Categories of membership:** the proposal calls for increase in the non-permanent membership of the Security Council only, and creating a new type of longer term seats for a term from 3 to 5 years without possibility of immediate re-election, or a term of two years with the possibility of up to two immediate re-elections - meaning a maximum term of 6 years provided two successful consecutive re-elections - which clearly reflects UFC's opposition to expansion in the permanent category, and thus does not meet the African demands for at least 2 Permanent Seats and 5 non-permanent seats in the expanded Security Council. And let me repeat that the Ezulwini Consensus is aiming at changing the power structure of the Security Council, and to affect the decision making process. We need to have an African institutional memory in the Security Council, not only for the current permanent members.

- 2- **Size and Regional Representation:** Egypt strongly believes that a balanced regional representation should be closely linked to the size of the enlarged Security Council. Therefore, we share in principle the idea reflected in the UFC proposal that the exact number of seats will depend on the total size of the expansion and the distribution of those seats among various regional groups, taking into account equitable geographical distribution. One of the strong points in the UFC position is the representation of small states, but is it based on demographic factors only (less than one million of population)? And what about the developing countries?

This is the reason why Africa's demand for no less than two permanent seats, including the Veto right, along with two additional non-permanent seats, should be read in a sense that Africa might demand more permanent seats if it feels that other regions smaller in number are getting more seats than their ratio of representation in numbers that would include the current permanent members and the new permanent members.

-On the other hand, the UFC proposal refers to: "Arrangements for representation in respect of the seats, including re-election and rotation, should be decided by the respective Regional Groups". This appears in the first look to be consistent with the African Common Position regarding the concept of Continent-Specific seats. However, when the Ezulwini Consensus stated that the African Union should be responsible for the selection of Africa's representatives in the Security Council and determining the criteria for such selection, it meant that Africa will select its representatives for the permanent and non-permanent categories without prejudice to or contradiction with article 23 of the Charter which will continue to govern the election process in the General Assembly. I must agree with Italy that electoral process guarantees accountability and democracy, but why don't we apply it to all Permanent Members old and new.

- 3- **The Question of the Veto:** The Italy/Colombia proposal introduced two options for the use of the Veto: abolition of the Veto or limitation in respect of the scope of the Veto to be only applicable on Chapter VII related matters. The First option responds to the African Common position on this issue, as Africa believes that the Veto should be abolished. However, as long as the Veto continues to exist, even if it is restricted in some cases (as it is proposed in the second option), Africa insists that the Veto should be fully extended without limitation to all new permanent members of the enlarged Security Council as a matter of common justice and in order to avoid creating two categories of permanent members, some of them with full fledged Veto and the others with limited scope of Veto power. This is one of the major differences between the UFC position and the African Common position, which is also the same major difference between the African Common position and the G4/L.69 draft resolution that speaks about permanent seats without Veto.
- 4- **The working methods of the Security Council and its relationship with the General Assembly:** Egypt believes that the elements included under these two important negotiable are not controversial for most of

the membership. However, they should be further elaborated within a comprehensive agreement covering all five negotiable as a package.

Finally, and despite the substantial differences between the Italy/ Colombia proposal and the African Common position, we note the openness and transparency by the UFC in introducing this proposal within the Intergovernmental negotiations in the form of a “Conference Room Paper” since January 2010. Furthermore, and with regard to the procedures, nobody can deny that this proposal covers the five interlinked negotiables in full conformity with General Assembly decision 62/557.

Furthermore, the question I want to ask, is the UFC position considered as an intermediate approach, including the Veto? And what are the modalities and guarantees to have the full Veto right after the intermediate phase while currently limited to Chapter VII related issues as proposed by the UFC? From the other hand, the issue of small and medium sized states, is it related to regional representation, or the demographic aspect is the only factor?
