

Netherlands: Statement at the General Assembly Informal and Interactive Dialogue on Early Warning, Assessment and the Responsibility to Protect

Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would, first of all, of course like to align myself fully with the statement of the European Union. I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this informal dialogue on early warning and assessment and to thank the Secretary General for his excellent report. The good attendance mentioned during your opening remarks shows that this subject is of great importance to the membership.

Already in 2005 during the World Summit, there was a call for the expansion of UN capacities for early warning and assessment of possible genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This has taken a while but the report by the SG gives us a good roadmap and we are making the necessary progress.

The report of the SG also makes clear that while there is generally no lack of relevant information, there is a lack of analytic capacity and information sharing both within and outside of the UN system, for example with regional organizations, civil society and the member states. The EU statement already mentioned the necessity to strengthen the cooperation between relevant departments and agencies, while rationalizing the different structures and mechanisms. This includes specific capacity to gather and analyse information through the lens of R2P. We therefore welcome the notion of the joint office of the two special advisors and look forward to the Secretary General's proposals.

Similarly, strengthening cooperation with regional organizations is of great importance. We welcome the SG's proposal of a similar interactive dialogue of the Assembly next year to discuss the role of regional and subregional organizations in implementing R2P. Many of these organizations, such as the OSCE, AU and EU, have lot of expertise and capacities in various useful fields. I do hope that regularizing the two-way flow of information, ideas and insights between the UN and the regional and subregional organizations on matters related to R2P will not wait until next year's discussion and that the issue of sharing information and analysis in particular will be discussed in current process of consultations.

The PR of India stressed the importance of the involvement of member states in gathering and analysing information for early warning and assessment. The SG's report on Srebrenica speaks of the reluctance of member states to share sensitive information with an organization as open and, from their perspective, as insecure as the UN. What kind of solution should we look for in this respect? Paragraph 11 of the SG's report is perhaps a bit too bland and optimistic in this respect. Can this problem be overcome by different procedures within the UN?

I would think that this problem of member states being unwilling to share sensitive information, while to a certain extent unavoidable, underlines the importance of making use of independent sources of information such as civil society groups, country and regional experts. Should some kind of formal or informal mechanism for a continuing conversation, as mentioned by the SG in his report, with independent sources be set up?

Besides accurate information, it is perhaps more important in the end to have the right sort of analysis. I was intrigued to read in paragraph 13 of the SG's report, and to listen to dr. Deng

on the framework of analysis he has developed. This framework describes the kind of information that is taken into account in assessing the risk of genocide in a given situation. This might also be useful as a kind of template for R2P cases, and also for information coming from sources outside of the UN.

Could the Special Advisors perhaps tell us a bit more on this and could this framework perhaps be of use as a kind of template for a wider framework of analysis for R2P situations, which would be used by member states, regional organisations and NGO's?

Thank you, Madam Chair.