

**63RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO THE UNITED NATIONS
INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS
ON
THE REFORM OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL:**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECURITY COUNCIL AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATEMENT

BY

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

NEW YORK, 20 APRIL 2009

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Mr. President

I would like to thank you for your letter dated 16 April 2009 in which you gave a concise summary of our last meeting as well as a good introduction to the topic we are discussing today. As you have mentioned in your letter, there is a strong link between the two topics working methods of the SC and the relationship between the SC and the GA. Without reiterating all the proposals put forward by the S 5 on the improvement of working methods, I would like to emphasize that the relationship between the SC and the GA is part of the working methods of the Council and therefore an integral part of any comprehensive SC reform.

The topic is central to our discussions by virtue of article 24. para. 1 of the Charter in which the members of the organization confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Charter therefore clearly stipulates that there is accountability on the part of the Council to the membership – and this was reaffirmed in the Summit Outcome Document of 2005. As the S-5, we have addressed this issues in two ways in our paper circulated. First there are the measures on access and transparency. They do not deal with the relationship between the two organs in a strict sense of the word, but they address it implicitly by providing for stronger involvement of the entire membership of the United Nations (such as briefings by UN officials to the SC, Consultations with non-members according to articles 31 and 32 of the Charter, providing draft resolutions and presidential statements, tentative forecasts or formal and informal reports)

And there are of course the measures that deal explicitly with the relationship between the two bodies. The most common demand in this respect has been “a more analytical report” of the SC to the GA. This proposal has probably been on the table for about a decade and features regularly in these discussions. It is exactly for this reason that we did not repeat in our reflection paper for this round. Instead of

repeating a demand that has been there for a long time for the SC to consider, we decided to focus on other aspects.

First, we believe that the President of the SC should hold regular consultations with the President of the GA. This is particularly helpful if the PGA informs the membership as a whole on those briefings and the points raised in them – otherwise it is a private exchange that may be interesting and even fruitful, but does not do anything to address the relationship between the two bodies. This in turn of course would open the door for member states asking the PGA to raise specific issues in the course of such briefings.

Second, we should look for additional formats to debate the report of the Security Council, in addition to the well-known sequence of national statements in the formal debate. We should explore informal formats, whether inside the UN building or otherwise, to create a genuine discussion and real exchange of views, ideas and suggestions.

The submission of special subject-oriented reports is provided for under article 24. para. 3 of the Charter and could help improve the relationship between the Council and the Assembly. The initiative for such reports could come from either side and the interaction between the two Presidents would of course offer an ideal opportunity to take up such ideas.

Improving the relationship between SC and GA is a crucial part of the SC reform and must be a central element of the efforts on working methods.

I thank you.