Mr. President,

For years, Hungary emphasized the need to move expeditiously towards a timely and comprehensive agreement on all aspects of Security Council reform. Hungary wishes to take decisive steps towards this goal by 2015, half century after the Security Council was last reformed.

The year of 2015, the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations will also be the year when Member States finalize their preparations for a more sustainable development, and plan to enter into a legally binding agreement on Climate Change.

Yet, Security Council reform seems to be at a standstill, or even worse, we seem to be in a self-inflicted time loop.

Unfortunately, this is neither science-fiction, nor a bad movie, this is the lamentable reality. We have been reliving our IGN discussions on the five key issues time-and-time again. We even force artificial amnesia on ourselves, since not even written records of new proposals, or summaries can be made. Similarly document Rev/3 and the report of the advisory group, is rejected by some, claiming that Security Council reform should be a State-driven process.

But how can a process be State-driven, if it denies recording of any new proposal, including proposals of States since more than four years? Mind it, document Rev/2 was issued in 2010.

Mr. President,

We have a problem that we have created for ourselves, partially, by adopting the same decision on the reform process for years, adhering to it as “agreed language” that commands consensus. Let me emphasize, Hungary is a great supporter of consensus. As we have said, we want to build consensus, instead of building camps. But consensus has to emerge at the end of the process on the substantive issues of reform. Consensus cannot be a prerequisite for all elements of the process, including procedural issues. More precisely, it can be required, but only with the devastating consequences that we are all witnessing. By emphasizing the need for consensus, we cannot even start negotiations, losing all chance to get to consensus.
So, how to move forward with the IGN process, how can we break out of the deadlock of self-repeating cycles?

- First, we agree that this should be a member state driven process. Therefore, all new proposals should also be compiled in a written format. It is only logical, that we put new proposals on equal footing with proposals that are already reflected in document Rev.2.
- Second, the next logical step would be to produce one draft text that could become the basis for substantive negotiations.
- Third, we have to have meetings at regular intervals producing new-and-new drafts, narrowing down differences and reducing the number of outstanding issues. Nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, but to get there, we have to start agreeing on something.

This logic might not be optimal to some delegations. There could be other ways to move forward. But lack of complete agreement on these procedural issues can no longer be used as justification for doing nothing.

Therefore, if this proposal is not acceptable, our suggestion would be to have the first IGN meetings dedicated solely for the IGN procedures and it’s way forward.

Indeed, we should move forward, change our rigid rules of engagement that shackled us, and our previous Chairman, Amb. Zahir Tannin, for years. While we thank him for his diligence under difficult circumstances, we are ready to change gears with the guidance of our new Chairman, Amb. Courtenay Rattray.

Thank you, Mr. President.