



ITALY

MEETING OF THE INFORMAL PLENARY OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND RELATED MATTERS

STATEMENT BY

PROF. VINCENZO SCOTTI

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF ITALY

(NEW YORK, 1 SEPTEMBER 2009)

Check against delivery

Mr. Chair,

on behalf of my Country I wish to express first of all our warm appreciation for the ability, hard work, and dedication that you, together with President D'Escoto, have shown in the leadership of this complex exercise. As I will explain later, in these months of negotiations we have already seen concrete progress. Credit for this is due to those who have persevered in a difficult mission that puts to the test the acumen of even the most able diplomats.

Mr. Chair,

The third and last round of the negotiations in the 63rd session of the General Assembly, which begins today, is an ideal occasion for summarizing the results of these months of work. During the first two rounds we addressed exhaustively every aspect of the reform, following different modalities: first discussing separately each of the key issues, and then addressing the various themes through their possible interconnections.

It is not my intention to repeat today my Country's view on every single item in this debate. We have made our position abundantly clear. What's more, Uniting for Consensus, interpreting in a truly open-minded spirit the appeals for flexibility launched by President D'Escoto and by the Chair of the negotiation, Ambassador Tanin, tabled quite some time ago a new and detailed proposal. Its purpose is to meet the two biggest needs that Member States have advanced in the course of the negotiations: namely, to have a Security Council that is more representative and more effective.

I would like to take advantage of this final round, instead, to underline some elements that I believe have emerged as positive common denominators. To draw conclusions in such a complex debate, divided at times by diametrically-opposed positions, is no simple matter. And I believe it is important to admit frankly that the differences are right there on the table; that there are some key points of the reform on which positions are still far apart; and that none of these visions is still capable of gathering the broad support needed to complete this exercise.

There are, however, three fundamental aspects that deserve to be underlined and that represent major progress:

1. **First of all, not only did the negotiations on substance begin during this GA session: they also took detailed shape and underwent substantial developments.** We can all remember the stormy transition from the 62nd to the 63rd General Assembly; the strong contrasts that marked the works of the Open-Ended Working Group from October to last January; and the difficulties in finding common ground on procedures that would assure the start-up and progress of the negotiations rather than their immediate failure. Despite the difficulties, the Open-Ended Working Group helped lend clarity to the matter. And the subsequent negotiation in this informal plenary did not limit itself to mere ceremony, as some had feared.

Thanks to the leadership of Ambassador Tanin, these negotiations have enabled us to examine the substance of the reform in all its aspects, to listen to the views of almost 130 Member States. We cannot deny that a great deal remains to be negotiated. And many Countries still have to take the floor. It is now crucial for all Member States to show the will to look for a compromise, and the readiness to develop their starting positions. The perspectives and the knowledge we have accumulated during this debate have given us a more concrete and sharp vision of our real prospects than we had last February.

2. **These months of negotiations allow us to see more definite prospects for Security Council reform.** They have demonstrated the existence of points of convergence. Various States and groups do continue to express different views on some issues, starting with the central issue of "categories."

But as we underlined during the second round, the debate has already helped us to identify aspects of the reform that are shared by otherwise very distant States. This is true for the size of the Security Council, where a

widely shared view has emerged around the mid-twenties or more; in favor of a greater openness by the Council in its relations with the General Assembly and the other main UN bodies; for a reform of working methods; and for an update of the decision-making mechanisms, including forms of limitations or self-limitations on the veto. These are central elements that cover much of the key issues and on which, to our way of seeing, we must continue to build in the conduct of these negotiations.

3. **Finally, the discussions have shown that there is no alternative to a comprehensive agreement.** We cannot establish the size of the expanded Security Council if we do not know the prerogatives of new Member States; we cannot reach an agreement on the veto if we do not have an understanding on categories; we cannot find a solution on regional representation without at the same time establishing the way the Council should be enlarged. Any objective observer would draw these same conclusions after witnessing these first months of negotiations. Any partial solution would counteract the will expressed by Member States for a genuine reform of the Security Council and give way to unsustainable imbalances within the Security Council.

* * *

Today's meeting, dedicated to the five key issues, is a worthy conclusion to this first part of the negotiations. The same cannot be said, I am sorry to say, about the meeting scheduled for tomorrow, in which we are arbitrarily called upon to speak about a specific presumed model, regardless of the other proposals on the table. But to return to today's theme, it is well known that the reform consists of five inextricably linked components.

Anyone who proposes partial solutions, focused only on some aspects while ignoring others, would not be interpreting the interests of the community of States for a more effective and representative Security Council. Instead they would be privileging specific national interests regarding status: namely, to obtain a seat in the Security Council for all time. Without any concern over the type of Council that might come out of it.

This is the recipe for the creation of a monster. What we all want instead is a body that is better able to maintain peace and security for everyone, protecting and representing everyone.

To achieve this goal what we must do now is continue our discussions in the 64th General Assembly, building on what we have thus far achieved. It is up to us to assure a smooth transition that is not disruptive, that puts the incoming President of the General Assembly, to whom we wish all the best, in a position where he continue in the wake of this 63rd UN General Assembly. This is why **what we are proposing today is a gentleman's agreement.**

We must not miss this opportunity. Despite the contrasts and diversity of views that have emerged, the negotiations have successfully enabled progress without excluding anyone. From the start of the 64th General Assembly, we can continue to build on our preliminary results. There are no alternatives. What we have to do is negotiate and discourage any attempts to get ahead of ourselves, whose only result would be to bathe this process in acrimony and create deep divisions, with the risk of useless delays at the start of the next General Assembly.

I would thus propose to all Member States to associate themselves with this commitment among gentlemen, to assure by the consensus of all the continuation of this complex process. A gentlemen's agreement that would prevent this informal plenary and the newly-elected President Al Treki from having to start from scratch. Let us not miss another opportunity. We have the obligation and the possibility to reap what we have thus far sown.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.