



**STATEMENT
BY**

**H.E. MR. REZLAN ISHAR JENIE
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE**

**AT THE OPEN DEBATE OF THE UNITED
NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL ON**

**"COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UN SECURITY
COUNCIL AND INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF RESOLUTION 1540 (2004) AND 1673 (2006)"**

NEW YORK, 23 FEBRUARY 2007

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
325 East 38th Street, New York, NY 10016 • Tel. (212) 972-8333 • Fax. (212) 972-9780
www.indonesiamission-ny.org email: ptri@indonesiamission-ny.org

Mr. President,

At the outset, on behalf of my delegation, I would like to extend our appreciation to you for convening this open debate on “Cooperation between the Security Council and international organizations in the implementation of Security Council Resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1673 (2006)”.

My delegation is also grateful that high-level representatives of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the World Custom Organization (WCO) are participating in this debate. Their valuable insights, experiences and lessons learned in the areas of concern to the two resolutions are important contributions that will be of benefit to this discussion.

Mr. President,

It is an established fact the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their means of delivery is very real. This threat of such weapons is magnified by the fact that they could fall into non-State actors including terrorist group. The continued existence of such weapons could contribute to illicit acquisition and trafficking of WMDs, as is illustrated by the A.Q Khan network and a recent case where a smuggler tried to sell a sample of highly-enriched uranium but was foiled by Georgian authorities.

The adoption of resolution 1540 took place against the background that previous WMD treaty regimes lacked universality and having been designed to deal with state entities only. They were thus seen by some as being ineffective in tackling the challenge of non-State actors. The mission of resolution 1540 was therefore to address this gap. As is reflected in its OP5 and OP8, resolution 1540 was intended only to complement and reinforce, rather than replace or subvert, the multilaterally negotiated treaties.

We are reminded that during the process of the adoption of resolution 1540, concern were expressed that the Security Council has taken on a legislative role in which it dictates domestic law to Member States and enforces non-proliferation obligations outside the traditional multilateral negotiating process.

Therefore we must work towards establishing a multilaterally-negotiated international legal instrument that will permanently address the gap being temporarily filled by this resolution.

Mr. President,

One of the key challenges before us is the ability of Member States to fulfill the central provisions of this resolution, for which national legislations may need to be enacted, and enforcement measures put in place. For the majority of states, a certain degree of technical and legal expertise is also required, as is the general issue of capacity. With reference to this point, it must also be borne in mind that the capacity to meet a State's obligations is not just a matter of overall state capabilities, but also one of national priorities.

For almost three years, the focus of the Committee has mainly been on encouraging the reporting requirement. While noting that reporting is indeed important to serve as a baseline for analysis, it is not the objective of the resolution.

The key point is full implementation of provisions of the resolution. For developing countries with limited resources and many other equally pressing priorities, the increasing burden of reporting in its various forms, could be overwhelming. Therefore it is timely for the Committee to focus more on the implementation phase. Cooperation between the Council and its Committee with specialized international organizations should be framed within the context of assisting States to build their capacity to implement their obligations in a sustainable manner.

The problem of implementation lies at the national level. In most cases, these problems derive from technical difficulties being faced by Member States. The Committee should therefore focus on programs which enhance the national capabilities of such countries in collaboration with existing international organizations in the field of the prohibition of WMD.

Full implementation of resolution 1540 is a long-term objective and an ongoing process. It will require continuous efforts, patience, dialogue, cooperation and assistance. As a result, it is our belief that sustained international cooperation is essential for achieving the objectives and purposes of resolution 1540.

Mr. President,

The 1540 Committee, which is tasked with examining the implementation of this resolution, is well placed to mobilize and coordinate an effective nonproliferation effort by garnering the support and assistance of various specialized international organizations in the execution of its mandate. While there are currently no substantive partnerships between these organizations and the Committee, this possibility could be explored in the future.

In this regard, the Security Council and the Committee should optimize the comparative advantage of the specialized international organizations. This partnership should strengthen practical cooperation, avoid duplication, promote cost effectiveness, strengthen synergy of efforts and increase effective use of resources and expertise.

In the areas of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons and their related materials the Committee should continue its cooperation with the Secretariat of IAEA and OPCW. Both organizations have within their respective fields and mandates, programs for States' capacity building that are directly relevant to resolution 1540. For instance, they maintain records of the status of national implementation measures of States parties to their respective regimes.

It is regrettable, however, that in the area of control of dangerous biological agents, we do not have similar organizations since there is not yet agreement on a protocol to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC).

Finally Mr. President,

While we pursue the non-proliferation initiative, however, we should not lose sight of the disarmament question. It is our conviction that in the end, the only guarantee for eliminating the fear caused by the possible use or threat of use of WMDs is their total elimination, because this is the only sure way of preventing non-State actors from acquiring them. We reiterate our call on all States, therefore, to work towards this fundamental goal.

Thank you Mr. President