



**Statement by H.E. Ambassador Munir Akram during the 5th
IGN Meeting on the way forward of the IGN Process
(May 04 2023)**

Distinguished Co-Chairs,

I wish to thank you for convening this fifth and final meeting of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council reform (IGN), which completes the scheduled IGN meetings for the 77th session of the General Assembly.

2. I would like to proudly align myself with the statement delivered earlier by the Permanent Representative of Italy on behalf of the Uniting for Consensus (UfC) Group as well as the statements that have been made here by other members of the UfC such as Mexico, Republic of Korea and Malta.

3. I would also like to thank you, Co-Chairs, for the skilful way in which you have guided the work of the IGN this year in difficult circumstances. We agree that your initiatives and the informal-informal exchanges, the interaction with academia have all breathed “new life” in the Security Council reform process.

4. For its part, the UfC has, in a spirit of accommodation, agreed to the webcast of the opening segment of the IGN sessions, and to the maintenance of the repository of the statements made in these opening segments.

Co-Chairs,

5. Pakistan believes that the IGN process offers the best avenue to reach an agreed outcome to the question of equitable representation and reform of the Security Council. It is only through patient exchanges, mutual accommodation and compromise that we can broaden the areas of convergence and reduce the points of divergence and thus evolve a “model” for the reform that can be accepted by the widest possible majority of Member States, as stipulated in Decision 62/557.

6. This year, the IGN has had constructive discussions on all five clusters. We have seen forward movement on the areas of "convergence" and have engaged in constructive and frank discussions on key areas of "divergence".

7. We take note of the Revised Co-Chairs Elements Paper. The paper, as previous Elements Papers, reflects the Co-Chair's understanding of the convergences and divergences among Member States on the issue of

Security Council reform. This Elements Paper is a useful modality to reflect our discussions, without compromising the official positions of various groups and states. It is the very informality of the Elements Paper which enables the reflection of progress and the identification of issues where differences need to be overcome. It is, therefore, essential to retain its informal nature. Any attempt to start "attributing" positions in the paper or to transform this paper into a "basis for negotiations" will destroy its informality and hence its value and harden divergent positions and reverse the progress made in this process this year. Likewise, we also believe that the so-called Framework Document, while incomplete, remains a useful reference document for our discussions.

Co-Chairs,

8. In the introductory section of your Paper, a reference to resolution 53/30 is missing and this is an important omission for the reasons that have been sighted by Italy and others.

9. My delegation also fully endorses the following statements on Convergences:

- that the reform of the Security Council is a Member States driven process;
- the principle of democracy remains an important principle;
- the IGN process is the legitimate and the most appropriate platform; and
- that the IGN should seek solutions that garner the widest political acceptance by Member States, as mentioned in Decision 62/557. And, here I would say that while this does not imply unanimity; it certainly does imply the desire for a consensus. Acceptance implies consensus and we are seeking the widest possible acceptance which in other words means consensus and this is what we aim for.

Co-Chairs,

10. The UfC continues to oppose any attempt to attribute positions in the Elements Paper. This will be counter-productive. And to respond to Brazil, let me say that the UfC is one group that has displayed the

maximum flexibility in our discussions so far over the years. We have not seen the same flexibility from G-4. Their position has not changed a bit. At least we have tried to evolve our position. And therefore on the issue of attributions I would like to say that besides the UfC, and the Arab and the African groups which you have mentioned in your paper, there are several other individual Member States, including some Permanent Members who have advocated that a prior agreement should be reached on the principles of the reform before proceeding to text-based negotiations.

11. As regards categories of membership, your paper rightly acknowledges that the expansion of the category of 2-year term non-permanent members is accepted by all Member States. However, the second convergence listed under “Categories of membership” is in our view only a potential, not an actual convergence. There is no convergence on the creation of new permanent members. Perhaps the possible convergence, which you Co-Chairs, wished to mention was the potential compromise between the proposals for permanent members and for two-year non-permanent seats i.e. the option of longer-term or re-electable non-permanent seats as offered by the UfC. And I am saddened by the statement of my colleague from Singapore who has opposed the multiplication of the caste system. But if one is opposed to the caste system, we should therefore desire not to expand that caste system in any category and therefore, there is a contradiction in his support for permanent members vis-a-vis opposition to the compromise offered by the UfC for re-electable or long-term non-permanent seats.

Co-Chairs,

12. The reform of the Security Council should redress the existing imbalances in regional representation – adding to the representation of the under-represented regions and reducing, or at least not adding to the representation of the over-represented regions.

13. We are sensitive to and supportive of Africa’s legitimate quest to rectify the “historic injustice” against Africa as reflected in Common African Position. This position is very different from the unbound national ambitions of the G-4. This historic injustice must be redressed as must similar historic injustices against the members of the OIC, against the Arab Group, against the small states and SIDS as just mentioned by Singapore and against Latin America. And therefore, if we are going to rectify these injustices, we need a deeper discussion to

ensure the equitable representation of all of these groups which have been subjective to historic injustices in the past.

Co-Chairs,

14. We have heard pleas for Security Council reform as a response to the current toxic, global security environment. But, recent events have only confirmed the fact that difficulties arise in the form of the vetoes exercise by permanent members of the Security Council. And therefore while one takes note of the recent developments, the problem cannot be the solution. You cannot then plead for more permanent members and more vetoes and more paralysis in the Security Council. A comprehensive reform of the Security Council can only be achieved through a Council which is more democratic, transparent, effective, accountable and representative of the interests of all Member States - small, medium and large. The UfC believes that we can achieve this goal through patient negotiations within the IGN to broaden the areas of convergence and reduce the areas of divergence on all the 5 “interlinked “Clusters” of issues.

15. While we certainly desire to achieve important progress and important decisions at the Summit of the Future next year, our ambition is focused on achieving substantive decisions and commitments on international peace and security, on disarmament, on development, on climate change and other substantive issues that we face. We are not rushing to fulfill our ambitions for a permanent seat on the Security Council.

Co-Chairs,

16. We look forward to a smooth roll over decision to continue the IGN process at the 78th session of the General Assembly and to resume our negotiations at the next session of the Assembly. The UfC remains constructive unlike the G-4 and we are in the forefront of attempting to find compromise and convergence. I must warn, however, that any attempt to utilize the roll-over decision to change the process or to change the substance of the process we are engaged in will have a dramatically negative response. We should move forward – but we should move forward with caution – speeding ahead is likely to lead to a serious accident and wrack the vehicle that we have which is the IGN process.

I thank you.