

**ITEM 9:  
REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

**ITEM 119  
QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE  
MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

**STATEMENT**

**BY**

**H.E. AMBASSADOR CHRISTIAN WENAWESER,  
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

**NEW YORK, 12 NOVEMBER 2009**

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Mr. President

Given the strong substantive connection between the two agenda items under consideration today, we welcome this joint debate and hope that it will offer guidance to you and your team in shaping the future course of action to be taken by this Assembly. The report of the Security Council is a central channel of communication between the Council and the rest of the membership – on whose behalf the Council carries out its work on international peace and security. Like many other States, we therefore take a particular interest in this report, compounded by our ongoing engagement in the area of working methods as a member of the S-5 group. Together with others, we have long held the view that the report in its traditional format does not serve the purpose of accountability. But we also believe that the ritualistic complaints in the annual debate of the report about the lack of analysis in it are little productive – and that they have certainly not brought about any significant change. We are happy to acknowledge, first of all, the efforts made in producing this year's report, in particular by the delegation of Uganda as the Presidency of the month of July. We also appreciated the opportunity given to the membership at the end of October to engage in an informal exchange on the report. Most importantly, we are grateful that the members of the Security Council were willing to discuss with the S-5 the format of the report and the difficulties encountered in its drafting - and to engage in an exchange of ideas how the process could be improved in the future. We were also most appreciative for your presence in this discussion, Mr. President, given the particular role of your office in the consideration of the report.

Mr. President

We look forward to continue our work, as the S-5 and together with Council members and other States, on concrete measures to make this a better report, but also to better use the opportunity to exchange views. We are under no illusion regarding the feasibility of a report that gives a full political analysis of the work of

the Council. This is indeed not a realistic demand. But certainly, there is room for improvement. Linkages between topics can be illustrated – in particular between country situations and thematic issues – and the report could also deal with cross-cutting issues, for example the discussions on the relationship between peace and justice. And we can certainly find better ways to engage each other on its contents. One aspect of the report that is of particular interest to us is naturally the way the report deals with the issue of working methods. The view is often advanced that the Council is the master of its own procedures and therefore of all matters related to working methods. If that is so, what better place than the annual report of the Council to report on developments in the area of working methods, what better opportunity to inform of progress made in the implementation of Presidential Note S/2006/507 ? Meanwhile, the report provides no information on actual developments in the area of working methods – even though some have occurred – except for a largely technical reference to the open debate of the Council on the matter (p. 49) and an equally meager summary of the Informal Working Group on Documentation (p. 239) – which incidentally seems to be the only SC working group that does not produce its own annual report (p.93). The interest of the larger membership in the issue of working methods is well known and has been documented extensively during the discussions on Security Council reform. We hope that this interest will be met by the Council in future reports and that the consideration of the annual report can therefore also offer an opportunity for an exchange on working methods.

Mr. President

The S-5 continue to work on two tracks to improve the working methods of the Council: First in the General Assembly, in the overall framework of the work on Security Council reform, and second in a direct engagement with Council members on a number of select issues that we take particular interest in – some of which are mentioned by other S-5 members in this debate. We encourage the participation of other States who share the same interest – such as in the case of the efforts to

promote fair and clear sanctions procedures where a formal proposal was submitted last year by some from the S5 and some other Member States. The progress on working methods is not conditional on or linked to a decision in the area of enlargement, given the different nature of the two processes. At the same time, a comprehensive solution that encompasses decisive steps on both enlargement and working methods remains our goal.

Mr. President

With respect to the enlargement discussion, we want to first thank Ambassador Tanin and his team for their tireless efforts and the skilled manner in which they have guided the process over the last session. They are the last ones to blame for the lack of progress. At the same time, this lack of progress has only strengthened our conviction that the only way to an early solution – to which we all committed ourselves in 2005 – is the intermediate approach, which offers a solution that is ratifiable, sustainable and yet flexible. We also see, of course, that flexibility and willingness to compromise are still minimal at best. It appears that the political momentum necessary for enlargement can only be created through challenges to the role and legitimacy of the Council that are not yet fully felt.

I thank you.