



**PERMANENT MISSION
OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
NEW YORK**

NEW YORK, 14 APRIL 2026

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY – INFORMAL MEETING OF THE PLENARY ON THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL
NEGOTIATIONS ON THE QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE
MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO THE COUNCIL
STATEMENT BY H.E. CHRISTIAN WENAWESER, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE**

Co-Chairs, Dear Colleagues

I am speaking today on behalf of a cross-regional group of 15 Member States: Austria, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Estonia, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mexico, Norway, Samoa, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste and my own country, Liechtenstein.

On 27 March, we wrote to all Member States, the President of the General Assembly, and the Secretary-General, to put forward a draft resolution on the Implementation of Article 27.3 of the Charter. This draft is meant as a basis for consultations with the membership, a process the authors have begun immediately after circulation of the draft resolution. We wish to thank many of you for the strong expressions of interest and overall positive reception we have received from the Membership so far.

Given that today we speak in the format of the IGN, let me in the first instance emphasize that this draft – as it says in its final preambular paragraph – does not itself constitute Security Council Reform and does therefore not fall within the purview of the IGN. We note that the working methods of the Security Council remain governed by the Council, and that it is the working methods of a future Council that fall under the purview of this process. Nevertheless, we see the

obvious relevance of our initiative to the topic that the co-chairs have requested us to discuss today, and acknowledge that paragraph 69(a) of the Pact for the Future, which the resolution seeks to implement, was facilitated and negotiated within the IGN. In this respect, we wish to briefly lay out the purpose of our text and are grateful for this opportunity for an exchange.

Co-Chairs,

Over recent years, we have witnessed significantly increased calls from the Membership, both inside and outside the Security Council, for the proper application of Article 27(3), in line with the original intent of the UN Charter. This is why the “Pact for the Future” that was adopted by consensus in September 2024 included language deciding to “fully implement and adhere to all provisions of the Charter of the United Nations as they relate to the decision-making process in the Security Council, including Article 27 (3) of the Charter”. Our draft text aims to act on that commitment within the responsibilities of the General Assembly, by clarifying the meaning of relevant terms within the Article and to thus assist the Council in ensuring transparency and consistency in its relevant practice.

The text, reaffirming the Pact, does three things:

Firstly, it puts forward two categories of acts that we have seen are common to calls to operationalize the “party to a dispute” term contained in Article 27(3). These are: the threat or use of armed force in violation of 2(4) of the Charter, and a competing territorial claim with another State. In our view, there are other possible circumstances in which a State may be a “party to a dispute” for the purpose of Article 27(3). But, having reviewed the practice to date, we believe these categories capture the core of the minimum standard in which the membership as a whole wishes to see this provision operationalized.

Secondly, it invites Members of the Security Council, who are themselves tasked with ensuring implementation of Article 27(3) under the Charter, to put on record their positions with regard

to the term “party to a dispute”. We do this not only in furtherance of the overall goal of transparency. We also wish to acknowledge that given that the Security Council is ultimately responsible for the implementation of 27(3), its Members should have the opportunity to clarify their positions regarding this provision on the record.

Third and finally, the resolution invites the Council to create a special report when the “party to a dispute” clause in accordance with Article 27(3) is invoked in the proceedings of the Security Council. This paragraph aims to create an incontrovertible record of the invocation of the “party to a dispute” provision, as has been done successfully with respect to the veto in the framework of resolution 76/262, also known as the Veto Initiative.

Co-Chairs,

The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties makes clear that every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it. As such, the same act of consent that binds States to a treaty enables them to participate in its interpretation. Thus, even for States that are not at present in a position to apply Article 27(3) themselves in the Security Council, we are still bound by our continuing obligations under the Article and have collective ownership of its interpretation. In this respect, the draft resolution does not create any obligations on Member States that we do not already have. It, indeed, does not itself create a mandate. Instead, it is meant to provide clarity on one of the most important procedural provisions of the Charter – in line with a clear call from Member States and from consensus agreements. It stays in line with the responsibilities of the General Assembly in Article 10 of the UN Charter. In clarifying the obligations of States under the Charter, it helps each of us live up to them, but also to create reasonable expectations of the proceedings of the Council. We look forward to working with all Member States through an inclusive process in the hope that we can adopt our text together – for the good of our organization and for the people we serve.

I thank you.