



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

---

NEW YORK, 8 NOVEMBER 2011

GENERAL ASSEMBLY – ITEM 30: REPORT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

**STATEMENT BY H.E. AMBASSADOR CHRISTIAN WENAWESER**

PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President,

We welcome this debate as a critical opportunity of communication and dialogue between the Council and the Member States. We appreciate the efforts made by Germany in producing the annual report and thank Portugal for its presentation to the Assembly this morning. As a member of the S-5 group, we align ourselves with the S-5 statement delivered by Costa Rica earlier this morning.

Our point of departure in considering the annual report is the Charter of the United Nations, which stipulates that the Council carries out its work on behalf of all Member States. Given the absence of other opportunities, the debate on the annual report would in principle be the best moment for a dialogue on the performance of the Council and its perception by the wider membership. At the same time, the report in its current format and also the way in which this debate is held are not conducive to a real dialogue. This is the reason why the S-5 group has made suggestions to improve the process both of preparing and then discussing the report, and it has engaged with Council members that have a special role in this respect. We are of course aware of the limitations of this tool and of the difficult discussions within the Council itself upon adoption of the report. Also, we view our effort during the past year as work in progress and will think of options for the future. These include the possibility of discussing the report in other, more informal, formats but also having an additional basis for discussing its work, since

the self-assessment of any international body will always be a limited undertaking. We look forward to the continued support and interest from Council members in this respect.

On the actual format of the report, we would like to offer the following comments:

- Of particular interest to us is the way in which the report deals with the issue of working methods. The report is the perfect place for the Council to report on developments in the area of working methods, to illustrate its ownership of the issue and to create a record in this respect. But the report only mentions that the Council made its debate and consultations more interactive. There is further a rather cryptic statement that the “Council ... aimed at increasing the transparency of its work” – indeed a key concern of the S-5 – without further elaborating on it. So we are left wondering whether there are other measures that were taken, but not reflected in the report. We see no indication of results emanating from the Informal Working Group on Documentation and just a very generic statement on the role that Presidential Note 507 plays in the practice of the Council. In particular, there is no reference to efforts of the Council to engage in a systematic implementation of that note.
- We continue to miss a systematic effort to link up the thematic discussions with the consideration of country situations within the Council. This seems indeed part of a problem that goes far beyond the actual format of the report: Thematic discussions are for the most part dealt with as stand-alone discussions, rather than as conceptual debates that should provide substantive and essential input for the Council’s work on country situations.
- And finally, we do believe that a more accurate record could be established by having those discussions reflected, in a very factual manner, on which the Council did in the end not find agreement. This can easily be done by giving equal weight to all the opinions expressed, without any judgment attached to it. We understand that this was discussed in the process of drafting the report and hope that this effort can be successful when the next report is prepared.

Mr. President

On the substance of its work, we congratulate the Council for its work done in connection with the situation in South Sudan. The successful holding of a referendum and the subsequent admission of this new country as a member of the United Nations illustrate how effective the Council can be if it is unified in its approach, even in very complex situations.

We also commend the Council for its unanimous decision to refer the situation in Libya to the International Criminal Court. This is a strong expression of the Council's willingness to fight impunity – if indeed it is followed-up by concrete action to give the necessary diplomatic support to the Court in carrying out its work. In this respect, a more systematic and comprehensive discussion of the Council's practice vis-à-vis the Court will be necessary for the future in order to generate more ownership within the Council of referrals to the International Criminal Court. The financial implications are only one, while an important, aspect of this discussion.

And third, we welcome the continued progress made in the Council's practice with respect to the sanctions regime established in resolution 1267 and especially the work done by the Ombudsperson Kimberly Prost. Late as these measures have come, they are certainly of the essence to put the Council's action on the right track and to prevent lasting damage to its record with respect to the observance of established international standards of due process.

While the Council reacted quickly to authorize the use of force in Libya, it has proven deadlocked on far less dramatic decisions, in particular on the situation in Syria, which is reflected under "other matters" in the report. We note in this respect in particular that two vetoes were cast in connection with a situation where the High Commissioner for Human Rights has indicated the need for an investigation into serious allegations of crimes against humanity. This reaffirms the belief reflected in the S-5 papers that rules governing the use of the veto would be of the essence. We also deplore the use of the veto in connection with a resolution on settlement policy which ran clearly counter to the stated views of a vast majority of the UN membership.

I thank you.