

Check against delivery

63<sup>rd</sup> Session of the  
General Assembly  
Plenary

Statement by  
H.E. Dr R.M. Marty M. Natalegawa  
Ambassador, Permanent Representative of  
the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations

at the Meeting of  
“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”

New York, 5 December 2008

**Mr. President,**

We thank you for convening this meeting. My delegation commends you for all your efforts in moving the process forward toward what we hope will be a comprehensive and robust reform of the Security Council.

Indonesia welcomes this debate which is intended to address the framework in order to prepare and facilitate intergovernmental negotiations at an informal General Assembly (GA) plenary by February 2009, which is in line with the decision 62/557. This discussion provides the opportunity to delegations <sup>to</sup> ~~for~~ focusing on specific parts, so as to maximize the chances of achieving results in the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG). This exercise is also a reality check for all of us whether we can produce a convergent point of view to conduct our business at the informal GA plenary.

The issues of Security Council reform are indeed profound.

∫ In the coming days, weeks and months, we will all have to work very hard, and would need to be more flexible. We should strive to arrive at greater commonality through a perspective that respects the plurality of our world, and benefits the humankind everywhere giving equitable opportunities to all. √

**Mr. President,**

As stated in our intervention on the 11<sup>th</sup> of November, Framework of the negotiations is where and how we would like to structure and put content in the negotiation.

We have agreed that the basic framework for negotiation will be the informal plenary meeting of the General Assembly and the distinguished Permanent Representative of Afghanistan, Ambassador Zahir Tanin will chair the negotiations on your behalf at the informal plenary of the Assembly.

We see these agreements are a narrow sense of a framework. We need to prepare further, in order to have a sound and comprehensive framework, so that the negotiations at the GA informal plenary can be efficient and effective.

In the view of my delegation, some important points, which would be helpful in building a sound framework, are:

First, <sup>w</sup>~~We~~ have to make it clear from the beginning how we are going to come to an agreement. The clearer we can make this in the OEWG, the more productive negotiation we will have in the informal plenary of GA. At this stage, we have agreed that there should be “the widest

possible political acceptance". But we have to be more specific on this concept.

There should be clarity on what constitutes the threshold for an agreement, and which rules would govern us, when we start the negotiations. In this regard, some of the varying elucidations are:

There are some who emphasize the importance of the GA resolution 53/30 of 1 December 1998. It points out that any resolution or decision on this issue should be adopted by the affirmative vote of at least two thirds of the members of the General Assembly. There are others who point to the importance and the wisdom for having well above the two-thirds affirmative vote.

We believe that the later perspective is quite convincing.

The experience of 1963, in which around 87 percent of the UN member states gave affirmative support for the enlargement of the Security Council, is a good reference point. The magnitude of the membership in coming to the agreement then, had paved the way for a relatively smoother ratification process in the different countries. Political bar, indeed, ought to be high for modification to the UN Charter. The issues are intricate, and we should seek greatest possible convergence among the delegations.

On the other hand, there are also those who support that the basis is only Article 18 of the UN Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which say that decisions of the Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

It should be clear, which rule will govern our future negotiations.

Second, the delegations would require a clear schedule and agenda before every negotiating session, so that they can adequately prepare and participate.

There needs to be more information on the established practises, in conducting negotiations at the informal GA plenary, how the meetings are recorded, how they are managed, how formal decisions are reached, etc. In this regard, the Secretariat can shed more light on the relevant information.

Lastly, it is obvious that we will also have to structure the “negotiables” for the Council’s reform. More details on those could be part of the modalities discussion that will be held at the OEWG in January 2009. In this context, the January 2009 OEWG meeting could take up further exploration of the primary objectives of negotiations.

We believe that the fundamental objective of the Security Council reform exercise should be to ensure equitable geographical representation, and enhance the Council's transparency, effectiveness and accountability to the wider UN membership.

The respect for the sovereign equality of the states, and their interests should be duly accorded. We underscore that the reform process must ensure the ownership of all member states, regions and sub-regions, as well as the constituencies, which have been under-represented in the Council's composition.

I thank you, Mr. President.