



**Statement by H.E. Mr. Nirupam Sen, Permanent Representative, on  
Agenda Item 110: Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the  
Organisation at the 60<sup>th</sup> Session of the United Nations General  
Assembly on September 29, 2005 in New York.**

Mr. President,

I would like to formally congratulate you and assure you of the full support of my delegation in your endeavours as we tackle the follow-up and implementation of the 2005 Outcome Document approved recently by our Heads of State and Government. The Report of the Secretary General on the Work of the Organization predates the Summit and in a sense the Outcome Document is a comment on the Report and the statements of our Heads of State and Government and Foreign Ministers constitute comments on the Outcome Document. To restrict comments to the Report would, therefore, be an exercise in futility, a putting back of the clock.

I would, therefore, briefly make some general observations on how we see our continuing work. In the first place, one of the lessons of the process leading to the Outcome Document is a transparent, open-ended process where the broadest possible agreement is sought through open debate.

One of the examples of such an agreement that unfortunately does not find place in the Outcome Document is trade and other important aspects of development. One cannot long continue to square the circle. One cannot go on talking of cancellation of debts but restrict this to IMF money and include recycled aid and debt; of growth without raising investment and savings rates through meeting ODA targets and using innovative sources of financing; of FDI where even physical infrastructure does not exist and public sector investment is required; of sustainable development without transfer of resources or transfer of environmentally-friendly technology; of the development dimension of the Doha Round without the principle of special and differential treatment; of achieving MDGs without achieving MDG 8. There was broad agreement between the G-77 and EU on giving a clear political direction to the WTO Ministerial meeting in December. This remains a vital necessity. That the UN has to give such direction and that such direction is heeded is shown by the impact of the Outcome Document on the

Fund and Bank. The Development Committee of the IMF and World Bank refers to the Document in urging developed countries to make concrete efforts to fulfil the 0.7% ODA target and also considers "enhancing the voice of the developing and transition countries in our institutions to be of vital importance" and will build political consensus in the context of the IMF quota review. Similarly, it is vital that monitoring the progress made in the implementation of MDG 8 by developed countries becomes an integral part of the monitoring of MDGs as a whole. Therefore, country-level reports by developed countries with regard to progress on commitments to developing countries remains important.

India has an extensive bilateral programme of economic and scientific cooperation with Africa through grants and credits that also encompass the vital areas of infrastructure and public health. We would welcome through UN system, mobilization of greater resources and coalitions of the willing not to wage war but to come together for joint initiatives in the areas of agriculture, water management and public health. Similar efforts, taking into account the special needs would be required in the case of LDCs, LLDCs and the implementation of the Mauritius strategy for SIDS.

The Outcome Document has given an impulse to the development of a strong counter-terrorism agenda. The Secretary General's address to the International Summit on Democracy, Terrorism and Security in Madrid this year remains relevant. The question of definition of an offence is a matter of precisely legal language and is already reflected in the text of the Draft Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism being considered by the Sixth Committee. The objective here is a criminal law instrument that would facilitate judicial cooperation, mutual assistance and extradition. The General Assembly has to deal with this issue or else the Security Council will continue to do so. Either the General Assembly would have to adopt a multilateral negotiated document or leave the UN Security Council to continue to deal with this in a partial piecemeal manner, governed by the political imperatives of the moment. We are near a compromise solution which would enable agreement on the important Article 18 of the Convention. The General Assembly has the central role in codifying international law. As Jennings said, we should not fall prey to "flights of erroneous fancy from the Nuremberg tribunal" and believe that "we are developing international law".

The facts speak for themselves. It is precisely the debate on the UN Security Council reform that gave synergy to the process of reform. The omissions on development and the lack of sufficient progress on Security Council reform led to some of the energy and colour going out of institutional reform and what followed. The reason is obvious. For any satisfactory progress one has to address the question of distribution of economic power and equally of political power of which, in the UN, the Security Council is the locus.

We look forward to working together on PBC, HRC and reform of the Secretariat. The UN Security Council has following Resolution 687, in a post-conflict settlement when the party defeated could not be considered to be an imminent threat to peace and security, imposed de facto Treaty obligations on States without their consent. Therefore, whether it is the HRC or, in this particular context, the PBC if we are not to repeat history, we would have to decide with a sense of history the questions of who

sets up the body and to whom it reports since these are not simple or innocent questions.

To overcome the marginalization of the developing countries their empowerment through reform of the Security Council remains imperative. We would continue to work with like-minded and other countries to reach the broadest possible agreement for an expansion of the permanent and non-permanent categories, to respect deadlines, and to bring the reform process to an early and successful conclusion.

There has been considerable progress in implementing reforms in the Secretariat. In so far as review of mandates is concerned, this is clearly a legislative prerogative which we hope the relevant inter-governmental bodies will complete expeditiously.

We look forward to proposals from the Secretary General on ethics and accountability as well as on the strengthening of the capacity and independence of oversight structures of the Organization. What are required are not new structures and posts but systems and sustained managerial attention to their enforcement.

The Capital Master Plan for the United Nations Headquarters in New York is an issue that has sadly enough been mired in what the Secretary-General terms as "political and financial dynamics". This has adversely affected the issues of both financing and "swing space". We await a comprehensive report from the Secretary-General during the current General Assembly session in order to take the urgently required decisions on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. President

BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS

---