



Permanent Mission  
of the Federal Republic of Germany  
to the United Nations  
New York



सत्यमेव जयते



**JOINT G4 STATEMENT  
BY BRAZIL, GERMANY, INDIA AND JAPAN**

**Delivered by H.E. Ambassador Syed Akbaruddin**  
Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations

At the Informal Meeting of the General Assembly  
on the Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council Reform

01 May 2019

**Co-Chairs,**

**Excellencies,**

**Distinguished colleagues,**

I make this statement on behalf of the G4 - Brazil, Germany, Japan and my own country, India.

**Co-Chairs,**

2. We take the floor with a sense of dismay.
3. This dismay stems from the concerns about the process we now seem to have stumbled into, without consultation and with no agreement at all.

4. Let me try and articulate our concerns by recalling the premise of decision 72/557 that forms the basis of our work this year.

5. The premise was that we build on the progress achieved in the past. To build upon what was agreed to in the past, we also need to stay true to the process that we followed in the past. Unless, of course, we collectively agree to change established practice.

6. In each of the past sessions, where the documents listed as the basis for this session were agreed upon, we followed a well-accepted process. Both of you also outlined in your letter dated 18 January 2019 your willingness to pursue progress “in line with the practices established in the 72<sup>nd</sup> session”.

7. If that is so, let me recall how we have done business here in the past.

8. We did so by the Co-Chairs raising issues, seeking clarifications and then providing us a draft paper that captured the essence of our discussions.

9. Such a draft paper was then subjected to repeated rounds of comments by all of us.

10. Usually, we spent between 1/3<sup>rd</sup> and 1/2 of our time during the entire session in such activity. The rest of our time was for making statements on specific issues and clarifying questions raised. It is not that we were particularly attached to these working methods in the IGN, but at least they provided a chance to break out of the circular discussion and make progress by working on the outcome.

11. As we enter the fourth meeting of this session, we discern a deviation from that pattern. This shift has taken place without any discussion. It has

taken place, even after several Member States have repeatedly requested an outcome paper that updates positions. Entering the penultimate meeting of this session, we are yet to be provided opportunities to assess what has been the result of the numerous clarifications that we provided.

12. By our count, statements have been made on all 5 clusters. Each of us have been asked to clarify 13 subsequent questions spread over 4 months. Yet, as of today, we do not even know how these positions, expressed on all 5 clusters and clarifications on at least 13 questions, will be reflected. Yet, we have been asked to further reflect on other issues and identify “perceived gaps in how positions are reflected so far”.

**Co-Chairs,**

13. Let me recollect that in your letter dated 25 March 2019, you had stated, “Given the close interconnections between all 5 key issues of the IGN, we further encourage delegations to consider, and address in their interventions, the relationship and impact of these two clusters under review with the three other clusters”. All of us dutifully did so. Yet again, in your letter of April 26, you have again invited us to engage in “a thorough discussion on the 5 clusters”.

14. By repeatedly discussing the very same issues, we are indeed making this process into what our friend from Singapore says is 'a vehicle for maintaining the status quo'.

**Co-Chairs,**

15. I also recollect the prescience of the PR of Australia, who after participating in one meeting in February, indicated that they will not participate anymore, since they do not want to repeat positions. Alas, such sentiments are gaining currency and not without reason. The process is driving Member States away. I hope this was not what was meant by “Member State Driven”.

**Co-Chairs,**

16. Regrettably, the process has gone awry.

17. It has strayed not merely because the practices of the past are not followed. The rationale that underpinned those practices does not seem to be understood. It entailed constructive and consistent engagement with and among Member States and engendered a sense of ownership by the membership. If there were disagreements on how an issue was to be reflected, there were also opportunities for course correction. Such avenues are no longer available. There has been no opportunity for Member States to provide feedback to adjust the product that is being fashioned as an outcome. Rarely can such flawed processes lead to satisfactory outcomes.

**Co-Chairs,**

18. If we want to salvage a satisfactory outcome, we need to revert to the established practice of having opportunities to review how our discussions have been captured once all 5 issues were covered. Not a one-off examination of an outcome that you have never shared before with us, which you may bring at the last meeting of the session. In this context, we reiterate support for the proposal made initially by South Africa to extend the series of meetings beyond those initially scheduled, so that we can work towards an outcome that allows for thorough engagement and review leading to progress that all of us can support.

**Co-Chairs,**

19. Having voiced our procedural concerns let me turn to our suggestions for an updated product of this session. Our views are well known. They cover all the 5 clusters and have been made before. They reflect the

specifics of our approach. For conceptual clarity, I summarise these under three different heads:

## **General**

1. Using the Revised Elements of Commonality and Issues for Further Consideration paper as the basis for incorporating changes suggested by so many delegations in this session, as no other template has been suggested thus far. Updating the Revised Elements of Commonality and Issues for Further Consideration will allow us to build upon the past rather than treat this session de novo. Consequently, going forward, this would be our collective offering for negotiations.
2. Provision of attribution that indicates the source of a proposal. On the lines of attribution, for instance, of the French-Mexican proposal on Veto, the Common African Position, the Arab group proposal for representation and the SIDS proposal for cross-regional representation.

## **Commonalities**

1. In the part on General Commonalities in section II (1) (f) - An appropriate reference to Resolution 53/30, which was adopted unanimously as the legal basis for decision making on issue of Reform of the Security Council.
2. In the part on Regional Representation in section II 6(d) - Reflection of the overwhelming support in the IGN for the Common African Position. To ensure clarity we the G/4 support the request made just now by the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone to annex the Common African Position in the outcome document we are planning for this session.

3. In the part on Regional Representation in section II 6 - Recognition that allocation of seats will be on the basis of the currently constituted regional groups.
4. In the part on The question of Veto in section II 5 - Acknowledgement that restriction on the veto has widest possible acceptance.

### **Issues for Further Consideration**

1. Renaming the heading of this section as “Issues for Further Negotiations”, as these are all matters listed on the basis of exchanges of views during the Intergovernmental Negotiations process. If we are in negotiations, we should acknowledge it. If we are not, we will not be fulfilling the mandate provided to us.
  2. Support [In part on categories of membership under section III 4(b)] the CARICOM’s assertion that reference to extension of only two-year seats is not borne out by any proposal.
20. For ease of reference, we will provide these submissions to you in writing. We look forward to their inclusion in the revised paper at the earliest and a return to established practice, so as to strive for a satisfactory outcome to this year’s discussion.

Thank you, Co-Chairs.