



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

NEW YORK, 21 FEBRUARY 2012

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS ON SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM

STATEMENT BY MR. STEFAN BARRIGA

MINISTER, DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. President

I thank you for convening today's exchange on Security Council Reform, focusing on the initiative of the Uniting of Consensus Group. Liechtenstein hopes that this exercise will bring us closer to real negotiations, and thus to the possibility that we might make real progress. We would also like to thank Italy for having re-circulated the UfC proposal of 21 January 2010, which gives us an opportunity to focus on the substantive issues at hand.

Mr. President

As is well known, Liechtenstein advocates for a compromise model that we think is the logical middle ground between the positions of the various negotiating groups, and that we hope will one day become the common ground. That compromise model is based on the idea of a new category of seats: **long-term, renewable seats**. There is in fact some overlap between our compromise model and the UfC proposal, as the UfC proposal includes the idea of a new category of seats of three to five years duration. There are however two important differences: First, we advocate for terms that are considerably longer than three to five years as a negotiating basis. We think that in order to make a real difference, the new category of seats

should allow members to acquire significant institutional memory. More importantly at this stage of this process though, we believe that only a considerably longer term length will make this approach interesting to those who advocate for permanent seats. Let us not forget, there is still a huge gap that needs to be bridged. Second, and based on the same reasoning, our compromise model foresees that such long-term seats should be immediately renewable. However, and this is very important to note, this should be counterbalanced by a provision that would prevent States from running for both the new category of seats and the regular two-year term – the so-called flip-flop clause.

Mr. President,

Liechtenstein appreciates the spirit of flexibility that the UfC group continues to express. It is also clear, however, that the parameter of such a negotiation cannot be consensus in the strictest meaning of the term. Obviously, we cannot give a de facto veto on this issue to every single delegation. What we need is a political consensus that reflects a very strong majority of Member States, beyond a two-thirds majority, and in particular a majority that will lead to a successful ratification process.

Mr. President,

As a member of the S-5, Liechtenstein appreciates the important ideas contained in the UfC proposal dealing with working methods reform. There is indeed significant overlap between these elements and those contained in the draft GA resolution circulated by the S-5. We do however insist that it would not be in the interest of the UN membership at large to make progress on working methods conditional on a breakthrough in the area of enlargement. As is becoming clear on a daily basis, the input of the general membership on the question of working methods is an urgent necessity. It is a step-by-step process that is – thankfully – different from enlargement in that it does not have to go through a ratification process. We need some measure of working methods reform immediately, and we will need even more working methods reform in the future, once we have found the magic formula on enlargement. I thank you.