



**PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES**  
United Nations Member States

*Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Tonga to the United Nations*  
250 East 51st Street  
New York, NY 10022

Phone: 917-369-1025  
Fax: 917-369-1024  
E-mail: tongaunmission@aol.com

---

**Statement by**

**H.E. Mrs. Fekitamoeloa 'Utoikamanu**  
**Ambassador/Permanent Representative**  
**Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Tonga**  
**to the United Nations**

**On behalf of the**  
**Pacific Small Island Developing States**

**OPEN ENDED WORKING GROUP ON SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM**

Monday 26<sup>th</sup> January 2009

Mr. President/ Mr. Chairman,

I have the honor to speak on behalf of the Pacific Small Islands Developing States (PSIDS) comprising: Fiji, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, and my own country, the Kingdom of Tonga.

We welcome this opportunity to participate in this debate 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**, especially as they relate to paragraph (c) of General Assembly decision 62/557. We thank you for organizing this meeting and would also like to acknowledge the efforts of your facilitator, H.E. Ambassador Zahir Tanin, the distinguished Permanent Representative of Afghanistan and wish to assure you both of our continued support.

Mr. President, this august institution has enjoyed success in the reform of the Peacebuilding Commission, DPKO and DFS, the Human Rights Council and indeed progress is being made in the reform of the UN System-Wide Coherence and Management reforms. The views and concerns of small island states were taken into consideration during the reform process of these subsidiary bodies and today we hope that the views and concerns of Small Island states, such as mine, are given sufficient weight, in discussions of the Open Ended Working Group on Security Council reform.

Mr. President,

GA decision 62/557 which was agreed to by consensus on the eve of 15 September 2008 was, to our delegations, clear in its articulation of the roadmap for the reform of the Security Council.

First, the GA decided, that building upon the progress so far, to continue to **address** within the OEWG the **framework and modalities** in order to **prepare and facilitate the intergovernmental negotiations** which was to be held in the informal plenary of the GA—no mandate was given to the OEWG to “negotiate”, rather its function, as we see it, was one of consultation, preparation and facilitation. It was also our understanding that the **results** of these **consultations**, would be presented to an informal plenary of the GA **no later than 01 February 2009**.

Second, the framework and modalities, as we understand it, are already contained in GA decision 62/557 of 15 Sep 08. This is the decision, where we, as Member States, were committed to reforming the Security Council through intergovernmental negotiations, in an open, transparent and inclusive manner, in the informal plenary of the GA, taking into account the positions of and proposals of Member States, in order to seek a solution that could garner the widest possible political acceptance by Member States.

and Principles of the United Nations as required under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 24 of the UN Charter.

It's perceived failure to act or its alleged unwillingness to act, on the behalf of the General Assembly and in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations has left us the legacy of reform that has been discussed within this forum for the past 15 years. This is now underpinned by the changing geopolitical realities of an emerging multi-polar world, comparatively different from when the UN was first established. We therefore seek a reformed Security Council, in line with contemporary realities and one which ~~is~~ takes into account the overall reform process of the United Nations.

Given this situation, Mr. President, allow me to outline very briefly our views, as small island states, on what we expect to see from a reformed Security Council.

First and foremost, we seek a Security Council that has an improved working method. What these improvements will be will of course be subject to the intergovernmental negotiation process however; **transparency, accountability, inclusiveness, and the right of representation during discussions of disputes in the council**, would be high on our agenda during the intergovernmental negotiations.

Second, we seek a Security Council that provides a **fair chance for all states to serve in the Council**. A reform that prevents member states from serving in more than any one category (that is, a better opportunity to serve). Big or small, North or South, East or West; we can all, in differentiated measure, contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. We therefore seek a Security Council more broadly representative of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Third, we seek a Security Council that will have **an increase in non-permanent seats for small states** so that all small states, given the unique challenges we face, are given an equitable chance to serve in a reformed Council.

Mr. President, these are our initial views—however, they are not prejudiced to our right of reassessment and review during the intergovernmental negotiation.

Allow me to conclude Mr. President by reaffirming our desire to proceed, without undue delay to intergovernmental negotiation and to negotiate in good faith, with mutual respect and in an open, inclusive, and transparent manner as agreed to in decision 62/557.

I thank you.

We also understand that the rules and procedures of the GA would be in effect, during any meetings of the informal plenary of the GA.

Mr. President, the basis for intergovernmental negotiations are also clearly spelled out in paragraph (e) of decision 62/557—therein lays our framework and modalities. Allow me if you will Mr. President to restate the agreed basis of intergovernmental negotiations— these were:

- The positions and proposals of Member States, regional groups and other Member States grouping,
- The five key issues; categories of membership, the question of the veto, regional representation, size of an enlarged Council and working methods of the Security Council, and the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly, and
- The following documents; report of the OEWG on its work during the 63<sup>rd</sup> session of the GA, GA decision 61/561 and report of the OEWG on its work during the 62<sup>nd</sup> session of the GA.

We note the **proposals** by Spain & Argentina, and Canada & Malta, on the framework and modalities for intergovernmental negotiations however, we would be concerned if moves are underway to reopen negotiations on a resolution that was adopted by consensus. Our position remains that decision 62/557 contains both the **framework and modalities** for intergovernmental negotiations. We therefore look forward, with much interest, to the report of the OEWG, on its consultations, by no later than **01 February 2009**.

Third, the intergovernmental negotiations were to commence **during the 63<sup>rd</sup> session of the GA but no later than 28 February 2009**. Given our understanding of this time line in the GA decision, our view is that it excluded any linkage between the preparatory and facilitative work of the OEWG and the commencement of the intergovernmental negotiations.

We would therefore also be very concerned Mr. President, if intergovernmental negotiations did not commence by no later than **28 February 2009**.

Mr. President

In discussing the reform of the Security Council, we ought to keep in mind the fundamental aim of the reform process and secondly to keep in mind the provisions of the UN charter in so far as they relate to the Security Council and the responsibilities inherent in the maintenance of international peace and security.

In seeking reform of the Security Council, member states have acknowledged that the Security Council, in carrying out its duties in the maintenance of international peace and security, has not always acted on the behalf of the General Assembly nor in accordance with the Purposes