

Remarks by H.E. Mr. Osama Abdelkhalek, the Deputy Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt, before the Fourth exchange of the 8th round of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the reform of the Security Council (13 March 2012): The L.69 initiative

- At the outset, I wish to thank you, Ambassador Tanin, for continuing with your programme of work and dedicating a separate meeting to each of the five initiatives in full conformity with your letter of 9 September 2011. This will give us another opportunity today to have an in-depth discussion of the L.69 initiative.
- I would like also to associate Egypt's remarks with the Statement by H.E. the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone on behalf of the African Group, and to thank H.E. the Permanent Representative of Jamaica for introducing the L.69 initiative today.
- Mr. Chair, Abiding by your letter of the First of March, I will briefly reflect on this initiative:
 - 1- The Ambassador of Jamaica mentioned today and during previous occasions that the L.69 Group comprises a diverse Group of 41 Countries from Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean. The only L.69 Members explicitly known to us are the 25 Co-sponsor Countries that appear on the Draft Resolution **L.69/ Rev.1 of 14 September 2007**. Since that date until today we haven't received or seen any formal document or letter of the L.69 Group listing the names of the Current Members of the Group, as all the letters issued by the L.69 are exclusively and jointly signed only by the Ambassadors of India and Jamaica since the beginning of the Intergovernmental Negotiations.

- 2- Both the G4 and L.69 initiatives include the same elements. The authors of the G4 initiative in their presentation explicitly indicated that their framework draft resolution **does not include the Veto**. In this context, I would like to seek clarification from the authors of the L.69 initiative whether their understanding of “new permanent seats having the same prerogatives and privileges of the current permanent seats” **does include granting the new permanent members the Veto or not**.
- 3- In case the L.69 initiative includes the Veto, this will lead us to ask whether the 80 written support for the L.69 initiative, as indicated in the joint letter of their Excellencies the Permanent Representatives of India and Jamaica on behalf of the L.69 Group, **are the same** 80 written support for the G4 initiative, despite this major difference in the provisions of both initiatives. It would lead us to wonder even more how two prominent members of the L.69 Group are in the same time members of the G4, which does not agree to grant the Veto to the new permanent members except after the review in 20 or 30 years?
- 4- Answering those two questions will help us clarify the existing ambiguity in the similarities or differences between the L.69 and the G4 initiatives, particularly as the Veto is the cornerstone to the African common position explicitly demanding that as long as the Veto exists, and as a matter of common justice, it should be extended to the new African permanent members in a manner that would correct the historical injustices.

- 5- Egypt appreciates the initiative by the L.69 Group as an important gathering of the developing countries, comprising many of the Developing Small and Island States, and welcomes the Group's repeated attempts to get closer to the African Group, as the largest gathering of developing Countries, most recently the ongoing consultations between the C10 and the L.69 and its anticipated support, though ambiguous, to the African Common Position.
- 6- However, we still do not see eye to eye on the issue of the Veto, particularly as the L.69 Group comprises some members of the G4. Let us here recall that what separated between the L.69 and the African Group in 2007, and still separates them until today, was their reluctance to add the Veto to their draft resolution and their attempt to deal with the Veto as a working method and not as a separate negotiable as stipulated in GA decision 62/557..
- 7- In this regard, we hope that these consultations would eventually lead the L.69 to consider amending their position, still hesitating on the veto, to fully reflect their previous pronouncements and statements supporting the African Common position and granting the Veto to the new permanent members explicitly.

In conclusion, and responding to your calls, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat that if the word "Veto" would be added to the G4/L.69 draft resolution coupled with the expansion of permanent category, I believe that all African Countries will, in that case, vote in favor of that draft resolution.
