

A stylized globe with a grid of latitude and longitude lines, rendered in a dark blue color. The globe is positioned in the upper left quadrant of the page.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Pathways to Security Council Reform

Project Director: Richard Gowan

Lead Researcher: Nora Gordon

May 2014

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The world faces old and new security challenges that are more complex than our multilateral and national institutions are currently capable of managing. International cooperation is ever more necessary in meeting these challenges. The NYU Center on International Cooperation (CIC) works to enhance international responses to conflict, insecurity, and scarcity through applied research and direct engagement with multilateral institutions and the wider policy community.

CIC's programs and research activities span the spectrum of conflict, insecurity, and scarcity issues. This allows us to see critical inter-connections and highlight the coherence often necessary for effective response. We have a particular concentration on the UN and multilateral responses to conflict.

Table of Contents

Pathways to Security Council Reform

A Report by the New York University Center on International Cooperation
Commissioned by the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations

Project Director: Richard Gowan, Research Director

Lead Researcher: Nora Gordon, Senior Program Officer

Acknowledgements	2
Executive Summary	3
I. Introduction: The Time is Ripe for Progress on Security Council Reform	4
II. Pathways to Reform: Seeking Opportunities	6
III. Next Steps: Potential Approaches in the Lead-Up to 2015	22
Conclusion	28
Annex	29
Endnotes	32

The views expressed in this paper are the authors' views alone, not those of the Center on International Cooperation or the Government of Japan.

Acknowledgements

The Center on International Cooperation is deeply grateful to the Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations for its support for this project.

The authors are grateful to all interviewees and survey participants that shared insight for this paper, including United Nations representatives, African Union representatives, and representatives from think tanks and NGOs.

A special thanks to H.E. Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Chair of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council Reform, for his helpful guidance and advice.

We express our great appreciation to Laura Nicolson for taking the time to share her useful insight.

Thanks also to the CIC staff who helped with this project: Antonie Evans, Alischa Kugel, Priyanka Mehrotra, and Ben Tortolani.

Executive Summary

In this paper, New York University's Center on International Cooperation (CIC) seeks to explore potential pathways to United Nations Security Council (UNSC) reform.

We begin with an overview of the current context, which has been characterized by increasing international pressure for Security Council reform. The Council's abysmal performance in the Syrian crisis has fueled the mounting pressure for reform, which includes the French proposal to limit use of the veto and Saudi Arabia's rejection of a non-permanent seat.

We then offer a brief history and analysis of previous reform attempts; an explanation of global perspectives on the issue of UNSC reform; background on the Intergovernmental Negotiations (IGN) on UNSC reform in New York; and an analysis of discussions on reform in and around the African Union.

Skepticism from both key players and leading foreign policy experts indicate that prospects for immediate reform remain elusive. Yet the vast majority of member states continue to be committed to finding potential options for reform. With 2015 marking ten years since the 2005 World Summit, fifty years since the last (and only) Council enlargement was implemented, and the seventieth anniversary of the UN, member states are looking to 2015 as a milestone for progress on UNSC reform. A well-planned approach to reform can build off of the momentum created by the 2015 milestone. CIC's recommendations outline a number of potential practical steps that can be taken to help facilitate tangible progress by 2015. They include:

- Conducting outreach in the lead-up to 2015 through the appointment of a Special Envoy or High-Level Panel and calling for a High-Level Meeting and expert-level meetings;
- Focusing on regional coordination on the Council and the dynamics of discussions of Council reform beyond New York, giving particular attention to regional diplomatic dynamics in Africa, Europe, and other areas;
- Engaging in discussions about limiting the use of the veto as a way to tie calls for reform to addressing concerns about the use of Council vetoes in mass atrocity situations and as a means for advancing dialogue between France, African countries, and other P5 members; and
- Exploring potential models for reform.

None of these approaches offers a "magic bullet" solution to reform. But if advocates for reform tackle obstacles to reform on multiple tracks simultaneously, they may create sufficient momentum for change – or at least identify new opportunities and coalitions for reform.

Pathways to Security Council Reform

I. Introduction: The Time is Ripe for Progress on Security Council Reform

International pressure for substantial reforms to the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is mounting, fueled in part by its abysmal performance in the Syrian crisis. Yet major obstacles to reform remain. Three of the five permanent members of the Council (China, Russia and the US) are opposed or at least skeptical towards any significant changes to the institution in the near future. There is still a lack of common vision for change amongst the various coalitions and regional groups involved in the debate in New York, and policy-makers outside the immediate orbit of the UN address the issue sporadically, if at all. A concerted push for reform by the “G4” aspirants for new permanent Council seats (Brazil, Germany, India and Japan) in 2011 did not result in a vote as it failed to elicit the required support of two-thirds majority in the General Assembly.¹ It is not clear that the current frustration over the Council’s response to Syria can be translated into a concrete agenda for reform that could win a greater level of support in the immediate future.

In this paper, New York University’s Center on International Cooperation (CIC) seeks to explore potential pathways to reform. Research contributing to this analysis includes interviews at the UN and African Union (AU), and surveys of leading experts from foreign policy think tanks. It argues that advocates for reform can break through some of the current deadlocks if they are willing to (i) invest in public diplomacy over the importance of a revitalized Security Council; (ii) tie their calls for reform to addressing key concerns such as the use of Council vetoes in mass atrocity situations; and (iii) pay greater attention to the dynamics of discussions on Council reform beyond New York, giving particular attention to regional diplomatic dynamics in Africa, Europe, and other areas.

None of these approaches offers a “magic bullet” solution to reform. But if advocates of reform tackle obstacles to reform on multiple tracks simultaneously, they may create sufficient momentum for change – or at least identify new opportunities and coalitions for reform. This will

require diplomatic flexibility and a willingness to bargain with other groups. Even if the chances of success remain uncertain, the alternative to activist diplomacy – passively accepting the scale of obstacles to reform – would be a strategic error.

1. Pressure for Reform

Current events have breathed new life into the Security Council reform conversation, generating renewed interest in the issue, not only regarding expansion of membership, but other reform issues such as the Council’s working methods and the use of the veto. The conflict in Syria and discord in the Security Council on the situation resulted in a chain of events. Vetoes from Russia and China blocked UNSC action in Syria three times in 2011-2012. In September 2013, the use of chemical weapons in Syria raised concerns as to whether the Security Council would be able to agree on a response. This sparked a surge of media attention, espousing the need for reform.²

In October 2013, after the Council had reached an agreement on Syria, French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius published a New York Times Op-Ed, which expressed frustration over the Council’s two-year paralysis over Syria and put forward a proposal for limiting use of the veto.³

Weeks later, Saudi Arabia rejected a non-permanent seat on the Council. Saudi Arabia described its decision as a response to the UN’s failure to address conflicts in the Middle East, specifically Syria and Palestine.⁴ Regardless of other factors that led to Saudi Arabia’s decision, Riyadh chose this circumstance to trumpet the call for reform. Many groups have backed Riyadh’s stance, including the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), the Arab League, and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). When Russia wielded its veto to block a Security Council response to its own actions in Ukraine in March 2014, criticisms of the Council’s veto practices were amplified. According to Professor Mark LeVine, “there is a growing sense that the only way to get rising powers to play a more proactive role in managing regional conflicts is through their greater empowerment within the international system.”⁵

2. The Reform Process: Opportunities and Obstacles

Current events have fueled member states' mounting frustration over the lack of progress on Security Council reform since a working group was set up to address the issue over two decades ago. Countries from a range of perspectives on Security Council reform increasingly see 2015 as a milestone year for reform. 2015 will mark ten years since the 2005 World Summit call for "early reform" of the Council, fifty years since the last (and only) Council enlargement was implemented, and the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations. Diplomats cite these landmarks as reasons for concrete progress to be made by next year.

Despite increased interest in UNSC reform, three main factors have impeded the reform process in recent years. The first and most significant is that the US, China, and Russia appear skeptical, with U.S. interest declining since the matter received some attention in 2009-2010.

A second factor impeding the process is that negotiations on Security Council reform at the UN have begun to lose momentum. As the Chair of these negotiations, Ambassador Zahir Tanin, wrote in July 2012, "[i]t is time to recognize the limits of what can further be achieved within the current framework of the Intergovernmental Negotiations (IGN) without a deepened Member State commitment to undertaking robust negotiations, involving active give and take."⁶ This give and take has yet to emerge, reflecting a risk-averse attitude or lack of interest among diplomats pessimistic about the process.

Third is that non-African member state groupings have not successfully managed to coordinate with Africa enough to gain full support of the African group on any joint model of or approach to reform, although some convergence has occurred in recent years. Meanwhile, continued lack of African unity on the issue of Security Council reform has impeded progress either through a deeper collaboration with like-minded countries, or the evolution of the Common African Position.

With 54 member states represented in one grouping, making up 42% of the 129 votes needed to pass a General Assembly resolution expanding the Council, Africa is *the* heavyweight in Security Council reform discussions. An upcoming retreat to revisit the Common African Position will reveal if there is potential for a shift in Africa's position.

3. Structure of the Paper

This paper seeks to address some of the most pressing impediments to Security Council reform. Section II on Pathways to Reform offers (i) a brief history of previous reform attempts; (ii) an explanation of global perspectives on the issue of UNSC reform based on surveys to foreign policy experts; (iii) background on and analysis of negotiations on UNSC reform in New York; and (iv) an analysis of discussions in and around the African Union based on interviews with key member states, AU officials, UN experts, and foreign policy analysts in Addis Ababa. This research informs Section III which offers recommendations on next steps and analyzes potential approaches to UNSC reform.

II. Pathways to Reform: Seeking Opportunities

1. Conditions for Successful Reform

Despite significant global changes in the last fifty years, the composition of the Council has not changed since the number of non-permanent members was increased in 1965.⁷ An amendment of the Charter of the United Nations is necessary for any changes in membership to the Security Council. According to Article 108 of the Charter, an amendment requires approval of a resolution to amend the Charter from two-thirds of the entire General Assembly followed by national ratification by two-thirds of the Member States, including all permanent UNSC members.⁸ Given the lengthy and cumbersome process of reforming the Council, successful reform requires significant interest and effort from the membership.

The “need for sufficient political will” of member states is a phrase often used by the Chair of the IGN and member state representatives. Academics and representatives of non-governmental organizations also cite the importance of “political will” frequently. But the real question for advocates of Council reform is *how* to generate sufficient will for change.

2. Precedents and Strategies for Reform

As in any diplomatic context, the “political will” for Council reform will be the product of interest-based political calculations, incentives and trade-offs among states and coalitions of states. Value-based arguments about equity, representation, and fairness at the UN are valid but have proven insufficient to motivate hard-headed diplomats to agree on a reform package. Advocates for reform must, therefore, identify approaches to reform that can affect the political calculations of governments and groups towards changing the UNSC.

Broadly speaking, there are three overall strategies for approaching this problem. The first is to advocate for Council reform “from above” by forging an elite consensus among the P5 and a few other powerful states on alterations to the Council’s composition. The second is to

drive reform “from below” by trying to consolidate support among two-thirds of the UN’s members and thereby pushing the P5 to accept changes they would otherwise reject.

The third approach is to advocate for change “from outside”: raising Council reform as an issue in forums beyond the UN, such as regional organizations, and to create external pressure on diplomats in New York to achieve reform. This may sound like unnecessary duplication, as the states represented in the AU, EU, and other forums are of course UN members. But, as this paper will note, officials working beyond the UN system often have little or no idea about their compatriots’ discussions of Council reform in New York. This disconnect reduces the global salience of the issue. This “outsider” strategy can also encompass interactions with non-governmental actors and the media to argue for reforms.

Historically, each of these strategies has borne fruit – although sometimes only briefly – in UNSC reform debates (see box). In 1963, developing countries in Africa and Asia pushed for an expansion of non-permanent seats in the face of opposition from four of the P5. Once they succeeded in gaining a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly, however, the P5 ratified the decision (with the USSR moving fastest). Expansion followed in 1965. By contrast, a major reform drive like by Ambassador Razali Ismail in 1996-1997 gathered support among the P5, but hopes for reform “from above” were disappointed when the Non-Aligned Movement – viewing the plan as a threat to their cohesion – moved to block it.

In the wake of the UN’s breakdown over Iraq in 2003, meanwhile, there was considerable pressure for Council reform “from outside,” with a high degree of international attention on the balance of power in UNSC. Secretary-General Kofi Annan and his High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change harnessed this by proposing models for reform, which the G4 used as the basis for an initially highly successful push for reform in the General Assembly. In mid-2005, it appeared quite likely that the G4 could gain two-thirds support for their claim to permanent seats, but their pressure for reform “from below” ran into

hefty opposition “from above” as China fought to block the reform and the US remained skeptical.

These precedents point to the fact that a push for reform ultimately cannot rest on a single strategy but must draw on backing from above, from below, and from outside. But advocates of reform have to consider how to sequence appeals for change to (i) the P5, (ii) the General Assembly, and (iii) governmental, regional and non-governmental actors beyond the UN.

3. The Current Situation

What set of strategies should advocates for UNSC reform pursue in the current international political climate? The chances of driving reform “from above” by bargaining primarily with the P5 look poor. The UK and France are outwardly committed to reform, but China and Russia have consistently appeared negative. The US position is also unpromising. The Obama administration seriously debated making Council reform a priority in 2009, but concluded that it should invest in other multilateral matters such as the G20 and IMF quota reform.

UNSC reform *might* have been a second-term concern for Obama, but the divisions over Libya and Syria in the Council in 2011 and 2012 convinced Washington that offering powers such as India and Brazil permanent seats could be counterproductive. The deteriorating American-Russian relationship, as well as tensions with China over Asian-Pacific affairs, makes the emergence of a P5 consensus on UNSC reform an extremely unlikely proposition.

The potential for reform “from below” within the General Assembly is somewhat greater but far from guaranteed. As the Chair of the IGN noted in 2012, “during the negotiations, a majority of delegations taking the floor have voiced support for an expansion in both categories, although delegations subscribe to different versions of this concept.”⁹ However, the G4 has found it difficult to shift from this simple majority to a two-thirds majority. Bridging that gap is the key to successful Council reform. But how?

The answer may be to pair continued diplomacy in the IGN with efforts to inspire greater support for reform “from outside.” As we have noted, the prospects for an outside-in drive for reform have risen during the Syrian crisis as a growing number of governments and regional organizations have expressed anger over the UNSC’s failure to deal with Damascus. The media and NGOs have also kept up a running commentary on the Council’s problems.

This paper suggests that advocates for reform should harness this anger by devoting more time to regional dynamics in Europe, the Arab world, and other regions (an approach validated by a global survey of independent experts described in the next section). However, it is especially important to engage with the African Union, an organization that has understandably paid less attention to Syria than the EU and Arab League. According to a 2010 Council on Foreign Relations report “...the 1965 amendment demonstrates that a well-organized bloc of developing countries can press UNSC reform over the reservations of permanent members. Today the African Union is well positioned to play the role of kingmaker, should it throw its numerical weight behind a reform framework.”¹⁰ The question for advocates of reform is how to incentivize the AU to take decisive steps in this direction.

While this paper gives particular emphasis to the AU, in addition to offering an up-to-date survey of General Assembly debates, we do not completely preclude serious P5 discussions. As we note in our conclusion, there is a need for confidence-building conversations between the P5 members on security and national interests – and their relationship to the UN – after the corrosive arguments over Libya, Syria, and Ukraine. These may take time to come together and be frustrating when they do. But if a broad array of states and regional organizations also press for Council reform, the P5 will also have to address how an altered UNSC could work for and against their interests. If there is enough pressure from UNSC reform “from below” and “from outside” the topic will finally gain attention “from above.”

Past Reform of the Council

1963

The number of UN member states grew from 51 in 1945 to 113 in 1963.¹ The push from decolonized countries for better representation on the Council both in numbers and in interests was a key driver of the decision to reform the Council in 1963.² Countries from Africa, Asia, and Latin America worked together and drafted the resolution that ultimately expanded the Council and came into force on 31st of August 1965.³

A 2010 Council on Foreign Relations report notes that domestic ratification would be more challenging today, and that today there is no parallel to the rapid surge of new member states from decolonization. However, the report argues that similar to 1963, permanent members may still be cautious about standing alone on this issue. P5 members that do not ratify reform resolutions in capital are in effect, wielding a veto, since P5 ratification is required as per the Charter. If permanent members today would be motivated like their predecessors to avoid the embarrassment of being the sole P5 dissenter to stand in the way of reform, this could play a role in future reform scenarios.⁴

The Razali Plan

Ambassador Ismail Razali, the 1996-7 President of the General Assembly (PGA) and then Chair of the Open-Ended Working Group, sought to push reform forward through his three-stage plan. The plan involved first a framework resolution deciding to add unnamed members to the Council, five permanent and two non-permanent; and second, a framework resolution selecting which countries would serve. The framework resolutions required two-thirds majority of those present and voting.⁵ The third stage required implementation of both framework resolutions through a Charter amendment. This requires favorable votes from two-thirds of the entire membership followed by domestic ratification.⁶ The third stage requires a more significant vote, but the groundwork for the resolution would have already been laid in the first two stages.⁷

Razali's plan was blocked by the NAM group, which saw the plan as a threat to their cohesion, along with Italy, who sought to block permanent membership of Germany and Japan. Razali's initiative shifted discussions in the OEWG to procedural issues, blocking the OEWG from making progress during the session, and bringing the PGA's legitimacy into question as a result of strong criticism from member states.⁸

1. Growth in United Nations membership, 1945-present, www.un.org/en/members/growth.shtml#1960

2. Thomas Weiss, *The Washington Quarterly*, Autumn 2003. http://www.iripaz.org/listado_docs/naciones_unidas/Thomas%20G.%20Weiss%20The%20Illusion%20of%20UNSecurity%20Council%20Reform.pdf

3. Kara C. McDonald and Stewart M. Patrick, "UN Security Council Enlargement and U.S. Interests," Council on Foreign Relations, December 2010, <http://www.cfr.org/international-organizations-and-alliances/un-security-council-enlargement-us-interests/p23363>

4. *Ibid.*

5. These resolutions involve "important questions" in relation to Security Council membership as specified in Article 18 of the Charter.

6. UN Charter, article 108.

7. Spyros Blavoukos and Dimitris Bourantonis, "Chairing Multilateral Negotiations: The Case of the United Nations," Routledge Research on the United Nations, New York, 2011, 56.

8. Blavoukos and Bourantonis, 58-9. For explanation of member state reform groupings, see Annex.

In Larger Freedom

In March 2005, Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented his report “In Larger Freedom” to set the agenda for the September 2005 World Summit. The report proposes an agenda for the Summit, involving a broad package of institutional reforms, including two models for Security Council reform. Model A involves expansion in both categories with six new permanent and three new two-year non-permanent seats. Model B does not expand the permanent category, but creates a new category of four-year renewable seats, proposing eight Council seats in the new category and one new two-year non-permanent, nonrenewable seat. For both models, seats are divided regionally and there are no new vetoes.⁹

Model A aimed to fit the requests of the G4 and its allies, while Model B was meant to be in line with UfC’s position. Neither model, nor other models that emerged from member state groupings in the discussions leading up to the World Summit, was put to a vote in September 2005 or thereafter.¹⁰ According to Jonas von Freiesleben, reasons behind the failure of this reform attempt include sharp opposition of the US and China to permanent membership of Germany and Japan respectively, and Africa’s insistence on the right to veto, which was not included in any other reform models.¹¹

According to Stephen John Stedman, the G4 missed an opportunity to negotiate with UfC in 2005 when UfC expressed openness to negotiating on the length of longer-term seats. At that time, the G4 were confident their draft resolution could pass, but months later when it became clear they could not obtain the necessary votes, the UfC was no longer interested in such a compromise.¹²

Edward Luck argued that the 2005 reform attempts repeated past failed attempts at reform. He noted that at the UN “political convergence precedes institutional change, not the other way around,” in reference to Razali’s attempt. Luck also speculates that the package deal presented by Kofi Annan was too ambitious, and that member states historically tend to prefer to “pick and choose” between options in steps toward reform.¹³ However, Section II(6), notes that many African interlocutors see great benefit in linking Security Council reform with broader institutional reform.

Luck also argued that at the time of Annan’s report, there was divergence of opinion amongst the membership as to whether in fact the UN was at a point of crossroads in which reform was the only solution for maintaining relevance.¹⁴ Stedman disagrees, noting that the Secretary-General was concerned that the US would leave the UN in the wake of the Council’s refusal to authorize the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, and due to the Bush administration’s strategies of preventive war and American primacy. “This is as close to an existential crisis as one gets in an international organization,” he said.¹⁵ Whether or not the political climate in 2005 reached the necessary breaking point to make reform possible, a widespread acceptance that there is a need for reform has grown since 2005. Today’s reform efforts face far fewer questions about whether or not reform is necessary, and rather focus more on what kind of reform is possible.

9. Report of the Secretary-General, “In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for all,” 21 March 2005, A/59/2005

10. McDonald and Patrick, December 2010, <http://www.cfr.org/international-organizations-and-alliances/un-security-council-enlargement-us-interests/p23363>.

11. Jonas von Freiesleben, “Reform of the Security Council,” Ch. 1, *Managing Change at the United Nations*, Center for UN Reform Education, <https://globalsolutions.org/files/public/documents/ManagingChange-1.pdf>

12. Stephen John Stedman, “UN Transformation in an Era of Soft Balancing,” Ch. 3, Bruce Jones, Shepard Forman, and Richard Gowan, eds, *Cooperating For Peace and Security*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2010, 48-9.

13. Edward C. Luck, “How Not to Reform the United Nations,” *Global Governance*, vol. 11, no. 4, October-December 2005, pp. 407-414. <http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/hpschmitz/PSC124/PSC124Readings/LuckUnitedNationsReform.pdf>

14. Ibid.

15. Stedman, 46.

4. Understanding Global Perspectives

CIC surveyed¹¹ experts from approximately 26 key countries to represent each of the major groups that are active on the issue of Security Council reform. The experts are from foreign policy think tanks and academic institutions. They specialize in the work of the UNSC and are knowledgeable about the issue of reform, or are widely respected, general foreign policy experts. Survey participants are from Africa, Asia (including East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East), the Caribbean, Europe, Latin America, and North America.

4.1 Key Points and Trends From Data

CIC's survey results are informative about the extent to which Security Council affairs features to think tankers and academics in capitals. They offer some internal insight as to how different member states are approaching the issue. While there is no common global view on the issue of UNSC reform outside the UN, a number of themes emerged from the survey responses:

- There was a common belief that comprehensive reform is unlikely in the short-term, but reforms in certain areas such as working methods are more feasible. According to Prof. Peter Wallensteen of Uppsala University, "There is a reasonable chance of *changing work habits* of the Council, i.e. improving transparency, reducing veto use to a minimum, etc. *Changing the composition* is tougher, and, first of all, requires an attractive alternative..."
- Many participants highlighted the important role of regions. "[A] more transparent and above all a more consensual approach within the different regional groups, could hopefully bring more traction in capitals and, one never knows, in the P5 capitals," noted H.E. Alex Reyn of the Egmont Institute, former Permanent Representative of Belgium to the UN. The Common African Position was seen as especially important in influencing reform stances outside of the continent.
- Respondents emphasized the necessity of P5 support, and several suggested working with more reform-minded P5 members. Dr. Thierry Tardy of the EU

Institute for Security Studies suggested that the best way to help the issue gain traction in capitals would be a "situation in which permanent members' cost/gains analysis of the current form of the SC shows that reform has become a necessity."

- There was a substantial call for working with civil society and academia. According to Prof. Annita Montoute of the University of the West Indies Institute of International Relations, "Greater national civil society interest in the issue...will change everything!"
- Participants expressed a need to bridge the disconnection between discussions on reform in New York and in capitals and to deepen the understanding of the discussions at the UN about UNSC reform both within Governments and civil society.

4.2 Frequency and Main Topics of Debate

UNSC reform is brought up with regularity in discussions amongst multilateral policy experts and with great frequency in academia. However, some participants note that interest on this issue has declined since 2005, and general populations have little awareness on the topic. The main issues discussed include:

The veto was mentioned by most participants as a key topic of discussion, particularly in light of the French proposal for restraint on veto use. Several participants, mostly from European countries, noted that there was a strong reaction from media and civil society to the French proposal. Some mentioned the relevance of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in this context. Interestingly, Danish respondent Prof. Peter Viggo Jakobsen, did not see the French proposal as realistic in the near future, noting that the Danish Foreign Ministry takes the same view.

Expansion of the Council was mostly of interest for respondents from countries that see themselves as likely candidates for new permanent seats. German respondent Dr. Volker Lehmann, who participated in his individual capacity, noted that Germany's ambition for a permanent seat on the Council has been a key issue discussed in Germany. However, he observes "there has been a more

realistic view over the last few years about how feasible this is.”

Representation issues were also key, particularly for participants from countries in the global South such as Guyana, Nigeria, Ethiopia, and St. Lucia.

Working methods issues were brought up more frequently from experts who have deeper involvement with the work of the Security Council. According to Dr. Robert Muggah, Dr. Eduarda Hamann, and Dr. Renata Giannini of the Igarapé Institute in Brazil, working methods of the Council are among the two key priority areas for reform for Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In addition to the issue of membership, the Brazilian Government emphasizes working methods “in order to provide more transparency and inclusiveness to its procedures, as well as to strengthen the capacity of the UN to implement the decisions of the Security Council.”

4.3 Levels of Optimism About Reform and Prospects for Gaining Traction in Capitals

The range of responses indicate diverse levels of optimism about the prospects for reform. Participants were most hopeful about progress on the Council’s working methods, many stating that reform has already made strides in this regard. Current events, Ukraine and Syria specifically; global economic trends; and the 70th anniversary of the UN were all noted as reasons why reform must be eminent. The most common response about the prospects for reform was that overall reform is not likely in the short-term, but there are possibilities for achieving reform in certain areas (working methods/veto limitations), and long-term reform could be possible under certain conditions. Examples include statements that reform would be possible:

- If regional approaches are adopted (the EU was mentioned repeatedly, AU and the Union of South American Nations [UNASUR] were also noted)
- If Germany and Italy could collaborate
- If the AU plays a leadership role (the need for clear, joint leadership from Nigeria and South Africa was mentioned)
- If capitals were better engaged with Security Council reform processes at the UN
- If emerging powers coordinate an approach
- If the global South is engaged more
- If NAM becomes an active advocate
- If France/UK take leadership in Europe and/or amongst P5
- If P5 support could be garnered, particularly the US, China, and Russia
- If the Security Council loses legitimacy and G20 or other institutions gain legitimacy

Regional approaches were mentioned by nearly all participants with a particular focus on Africa and the EU. Many of the “ifs” offered in regards to potential reform made P5 support a key conditional. “If America became an advocate! Or perhaps if a proposal was adopted by two or three significant regional neighbours,” said Prof. John Langmore of Australia. A few more dramatic conditions for reform were also mentioned by more skeptical participants who responded to questions about the likelihood of reform as follows:

- There is “no immediate prospect for reform, unless unexpectedly a political tsunami occurs...” – Professor CSR Murthy, Centre for International Politics, Organization, and Disarmament, New Delhi.
- “Of course reform will come about, but this will probably be the result of a sudden and important crisis. Only in these situations do countries muster the will for substantial change. Very similar to the impact (of) 9/11 on

the reinvention of NATO” – Dr. Katy Clément, Leadership in Conflict Management Programme, Geneva Center for Security Policy.

Jeremy Shapiro of the Brookings Institution in Washington DC responded similarly to questions as to what would help the issue to gain traction in capitals. He answered, “Another world war. This is not quite as flip [*sic*] an answer as it seems. I think it is fundamentally impossible to do a consensus reform of the UNSC (on the core issues of membership and veto) with all of the cross-cutting issues involved. The Security Council rules are fundamentally unfair and were imposed by just a few powers (three, really). They cannot be reformed through a consensus process.”

These statements indicate that reform efforts are not on track to succeed in the near future. That is why major shifts in approach, including making incremental steps toward a long-term vision for reform is a more realistic path to UNSC reform. Section III on Next Steps takes this point into consideration.

Surprisingly, one participant argued against reforming the Council altogether. H.E. Professor Kamel Abu Jaber of the Jordan Institute For Middle East Studies, and former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Jordan, argued that beginning a discussion on reform is like opening Pandora’s box, which is not necessary in the current political climate. His remarks about regional dynamics help explain his perspective. “Our life in the region is so insane and insecure that few are contemplating the question,” Jaber said. This is an important sentiment to register for member states focused on reform and seeking allies among member states that are struggling with conflict in their regions. Another participant pointed out that reform would be more likely if it is made a humanitarian/human rights issue. The tangible benefits of reform have to be understood by individual countries in order to gain their support on any reform model. Jaber’s point is a sign that such a connection is not always clear, particularly for member states dealing with urgent security issues. One area in which to make this connection is that leadership roles for rising powers in international institutions will augment their engagement in addressing security issues within their regions.

A strong suggestion came from the global south as well as some European participants for more involvement from civil society on Security Council reform. For example, Igarape, a Brazilian think tank is co-organizing a seminar with the Governments of Brazil and the Netherlands in 2014. Calls for outreach from governments and the UN to raise awareness about the issue of UNSC reform were said to have the potential for helping the issue to gain more traction. Exchanges about UNSC reform between civil society groups from different countries and regions were also widely regarded as helpful for reform. Linking with academia was stressed as an important method for promoting widespread awareness and generating fresh ideas. Some noted that engaging youth on the issue would help build interest within future generations.

Other responders noted that there was a lack of connection between capitals and the negotiations in New York. This issue was noted by the Chair of the IGN in 2012.¹² Suggestions were made that seminars and workshops could help raise awareness about reform and bring together government officials in New York, in capitals, and civil society to collaborate on approaches. Further discussion on potential approaches to engaging capitals can be found in Section III.

4.4 Likelihood of Governments Shifting Positions and Regional Dynamics

Some participants did not see likelihood of their governments shifting. These include one participant from a P5 country, two respondents from G4 countries, and one from UfC. A few participants pointed out that countries do not often bring up the issue of reform during their campaigns for non-permanent seats on the Council.

Most respondents who could foresee changes in their governments’ positions saw such flexibility stemming from the establishment of regional consensus or shifts in regional positions. Respondents from African countries thought that shifts in the African group’s position would result in position changes in their respective capitals. Strikingly, participants on different poles of the European debate on reform agreed that regional shifts could lead to domestic policy changes. A South American participant

speculated that his Government might be influenced if a regional organization like UNASUR were to take a position on reform.

Nearly all participants cited the strength of regional influences. Several European experts suggested regional seats for Europe, noting that this approach would be in line with European Security Strategy, but that it would be difficult to convince the UK and France. However, according to Prof. Edith Drieskens of University of Leuven, regional UNSC seats are a theoretical, rather than realistic option.¹³ African consensus was also seen as crucial for agreement on any reform model, and a shift in the African position could influence non-African states to shift their positions (see Section III for more details on this possibility).

5. Understanding the Current Situation in New York

5.1 Overview of the IGN

The United Nations member states are currently in their tenth round of Intergovernmental Negotiations on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Related Matters (IGN). H.E. Ambassador Zahir Tanin, Permanent Representative of Afghanistan to the UN, has chaired the IGN since they began in February 2009.

Commencing the IGN was an achievement in itself after nearly two and a half decades of the Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) that preceded the IGN. The consensus decision-making rule made any mediation attempts by OEWG Chairs particularly difficult.¹⁴ Some member states saw the shift to the IGN, as determined in General Assembly (GA) decision 62/557, as a procedural breakthrough. It established an informal plenary of the GA, and therefore, member states argued that establishment of the IGN signified a shift away from the consensus decision-making required in the OEWG's mandate.¹⁵

Initially, the Chair structured IGN discussions based on the five key issues, which are specified in General Assembly decision 62/557: categories of membership; the question of the veto; regional representation; size of an enlarged

Security Council and working methods of the Council; and the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly. In the fourth round of IGN, member states united around a call for a text-based approach. The establishment of text-based negotiations through a document compiled by the Chair, which includes all positions submitted by member states, is one of the key developments in the reform process since the beginning of the OEWG in 1994.¹⁶ The text is organized according to the five key issues and is currently in its third revision (Rev3). The most up-to-date version of Rev3 was circulated in April 2013 along with a "shorter document" that was meant to serve as a "user-friendly guide" for the lengthy negotiation text. The shorter document is organized based on the five key issues and consists of section headings from the 31-page text.¹⁷

Discussions that followed the distribution of the original negotiation text in May 2010 focused on the text and its subsequent revisions until the eighth round during the 66th GA Session, which was based on member state initiatives that had been submitted to the Chair. In previous IGN, member states criticized one another for merely reciting well-known positions in redundant statements. Addressing this concern, the Chair encouraged rounds of questions and responses amongst the membership during the eighth round. The eighth round was seen by many member states as a step toward "real negotiations." The 66th GA also featured a retreat hosted by then President of the General Assembly (PGA), H.E. Nassir Abdulaziz Al-Nasser, which included ambassadors from key member states as well as academics and NGOs. The Chair sent a letter to all member states in July 2012, which offered background details and current accounts of reform efforts as well as the Chair's reflections, observations, and recommendations. The recommendations included deepening member states' commitment to negotiating on various reform models; tasking the Chair with drafting a concise working document that would serve as the basis for negotiations; and reinforcing political links to capitals through a High-Level Meeting on UNSC reform.¹⁸

Most member states considered the Chair's letter to be a bold step, however, whether or not they supported such a bold step from the Chair depended largely on their

perspectives on reform. Some member states argued that the Chair is not in a position to make recommendations given the membership driven nature of the process.¹⁹ Others who supported the Chair's letter urged him to go further by producing a concise working document, as suggested in his recommendations.

Many member states agreed with the Chair's call to "reinforce political links to capitals," but few member states heeded his call for a High-Level Meeting. However, a year later member states began to call for action on reform for the upcoming 2015 milestone. The possibility of a High Level Meeting in 2015 could emerge as a possible compromise acceptable to those member states calling for actual reform resolutions or concise working documents as the basis of reform to be completed by 2015.

The following GA session saw a significant loss of momentum, with diverging views between the Chair and PGA as to when to hold the first meeting. The PGA of the 67th session had reservations about commencing the Chair's intended meetings. This stalled the IGN until April 2013. Member states expressed frustration at the slow pace of reform during the 67th session, even more so than in previous sessions.²⁰

5.2 The Current Session

Upon taking office, the PGA of the 68th session, H.E. John Ashe sought to rebuild momentum for reform. He reappointed H. E. Ambassador Tanin as Chair. Ashe also appointed a group to advise him on the process. The PGA's advisory group represented various key interest groups on reform. It consisted of the Permanent Representatives of Belgium, Brazil (G4 and L69), Liechtenstein (Former S5), Papua New Guinea (Pacific SIDS and L69), San Marino (UfC), and Sierra Leone (C10).²¹

The advisory group produced a non-paper, which is described by the PGA as a "set of ideas pertaining to the negotiations...intended to be an instrument to assist in the organization of the IGN, while ensuring that General Assembly decision 62/557 remains the continued basis for the IGN process."²² The PGA sent the non-paper to the Chair, copying all UN permanent representatives,

inviting the Chair to use "any or all of the ideas contained in the Non Paper as a guide." The non-paper was sent along with a memo from Ambassador Bodini, Permanent Representative of San Marino to the UN, which noted that he did not participate in the preparation of the paper and called for more IGN meetings with a role for the Advisory Group in advising the PGA on "the way forward."

Similar to the "shorter document" that was circulated with Rev3, the non-paper is structured around the five key issues of reform, but contains an additional section on cross-cutting issues. These include proposals on Charter amendments required for various enlargement models and possible review clauses. The non-paper captures the main positions under each issue area. It presents charts to show how different enlargement models affect regional representation, and includes cross-regional suggestions.²³ From March until May 2014, the Chair is holding a series of IGN informal plenary meetings each based on the five key issues.

5.3 Current Member State Perspectives

Member states agreed on the text-based approach to negotiations and generally accept the Chair's 31-page negotiation text as a useful tool for negotiations. Some members of the African group and UfC, however, continue to make vague criticisms of the text in its current state and have expressed preference for either editing Rev3 or returning to Rev2.²⁴ Meanwhile, the majority of countries that support the models of expansion in both categories of Membership, (G4, CARICOM, and L69), have been supportive of Rev3 and continue to call for the production of a concise working document by the Chair or PGA.

Member states had mixed reactions to the non-paper produced by the Advisory Group. According to a report from the Center for UN Reform Education, G4 countries and their allies, L69 countries, and CARICOM were strong supporters at the December 2013 IGN. The UK welcomed the non-paper for consideration, noting disagreement with some of the options contained within it. France stated that the paper could help guide discussions. The US argued that the paper could inform discussions, but noted that their view that expansion in the permanent category

must be country-specific was not mentioned. On the other hand, Russia, China, and the Arab group represented by Kuwait, all argued that the paper was not representative of all positions. UfC countries raised their concerns about the paper, arguing that it was not reflective of the membership. Some criticized the selection of the Advisory Group as imbalanced.²⁵ South Africa spoke in support of the paper during the IGN, but the C10 merely took note of the non-paper in its January 2014 report, despite Sierra Leone's inclusion in the Advisory Group.

The PGA describes the non-paper as a “useful tool” to aid the IGN process. Similarly, when the Chair submitted Rev3 and its “shorter document”, he explained that it could serve as a “stand-alone, operational tool.”²⁶ Therefore, as defined by leadership on this issue, member states now have two concise documents that aim to assist the reform process: Rev3's shorter document, and the non-paper of the Advisory Group. Each seeks to capture the main elements of all member state positions on reform. Some member states have criticized both documents, though the non-paper backlash is more recent. The shorter paper linked to Rev3 may be a preferable option between the two for some member states since it is based on a document (Rev3) that is inclusive of all positions. As the Chair, and membership, repeatedly note, the membership driven nature of the process is crucial. In that case, with a dearth of viable alternatives offered from the floor to the production of yet another concise text, member states may need to take leadership in regards to editing the texts offered to them and negotiating with individual member states on language in order to produce a text that could be more widely accepted as suitable for discussion in the IGN.

5.4 The French Proposal

Although outside of the IGN process, another key topic for discussion during the current GA session has been the French proposal on limitations to the veto. The suggestion was articulated in an op-ed from the French Foreign Minister, Laurent Fabius in the *New York Times*.²⁷ It involves the P5 adopting a new code of conduct in which they voluntarily limit their use of the veto, agreeing not to use it in cases of “mass crime.” At the request of at least

fifty member states, the Secretary-General would be given the responsibility of determining the nature of the crime. The proposal also gives an out to the P5, in that the rule need not apply in matters that involve their “vital national interests.”²⁸ Some experts and member states are skeptical about this aspect of the proposal.

A number of member states have taken an interest and mentioned support for the idea during both the GA debate and IGN sessions. The UK has expressed public support for France's proposal as the two countries hold a common position on reform, but is believed to have some doubts about its implementation. Some key ACT countries such as Liechtenstein and Switzerland are particularly vocal in their support. The French are also seeking advice from academic and civil society experts on potential implementation of the proposal.

Some member states have discussed a possible GA resolution. However, others argue that this could kill the idea before it has gotten off the ground. The French are prioritizing consultations amongst the P5 and view it as a matter for permanent members to define. The US may be more amenable to the discussion on the French proposal, particularly given its current UN Permanent Representative Samantha Power's human rights background. It may also be an opportunity for the Obama administration to revive some of the enthusiasm that emerged early in the President's first term with expectations for foreign policy changes that incorporate international human rights. China and Russia will need serious convincing to support such an initiative. Some experts speculate that it may require a situation in which countries are shamed into adopting the new code of conduct out of the embarrassment of being among the last to support an initiative that prevents serious human rights violations.²⁹ Ongoing informal discussions involving civil society will help determine possible ways to take forward the proposal.

5.5 New Regional Dynamics

Many member states have formed regional positions on Security Council reform. Some of these regional groupings have been more active on UNSC reform in recent years.

The African Group (represented by the C-10 committee of ten African Countries, which negotiates on behalf of Africa) and the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) are the most active regional groupings advocating for specific proposals on UNSC reform.³⁰ However, the League of Arab States has been more active in the current GA session.

The Arab League, represented by the Arab Group in UNSC reform debates, has recently amplified its call for reform, both at UN debates and in member state capitals. This followed Saudi Arabia's rejection of a non-permanent seat on the Council.³¹ The Arab League has joined Riyadh in its call for reform, expressing solidarity along with the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) and other groups. The Arab League has shown signs of active engagement with the UNSC in regards to conflicts involving its member states, most recently Syria through the establishment of an Arab League/UN Joint Special Envoy in 2012. While the Arab League has not shown a systematic approach to an increased regional role on the Council, it has increased its involvement in certain situations, particularly with a united call for the UNSC to take action in Syria.

Discussions on Security Council reform are also affected by new regional dynamics. A number of regional entities have taken a new interest in the UNSC, but are approaching it in different ways. The European Union has taken a procedural approach to increasing its collective involvement at the UN, including the Security Council. The African Union is more recently seeking ways in which it can increase African unity and representation of the continent on the Council. More details about the EU example are described below and extensive analysis of the AU can be found in Section II(6).

While new regional dynamics feed the UNSC reform debate, there is no common approach either on models or process for reform. And while many regional organizations have recently taken a greater interest in both UNSC reform and in being actively engaged with the Council itself, others such as UNASUR and ASEAN have not made notable attempts to augment their participation on the Council.

5.5.1 The EU Example

The EU has increased its participation at the UN through establishing enhanced observer status, developing its delegation to the UN, participating in UNSC debates, and increasing its collective involvement through the role assigned to the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.³² In May 2011, through a GA resolution, the EU established reinforced observer status, which included additional rights to the "observer status" of the European Economic Community gained in 1974. According to A/RES/65/276, similar modalities for participation may be adopted for any other regional organization "whose member states have agreed arrangements that allow that organization's representatives to speak on behalf of the organization and its Member States"³³ if such a request is made on behalf of the regional organization.

Through the resolution, the EU is able to inscribe on the speakers' list among representatives of major groups, circulate documents directly, present proposals and amendments orally, and has the right of reply. At the same time, the EU has sought to enhance its participation in the UNSC: the EU inscribes on the speakers' list under Rule 39 of the UNSC provisional rules of procedure, which states that non-state entities may be invited to UNSC meetings; EU permanent representatives and experts from member states that hold seats on the UNSC meet monthly; and the EU has sought to play a greater role in issues involving peacekeeping and international peace and security. However, with its current status the EU does not have the right to vote, co-sponsor resolutions or decisions, participate in elections, or be seated among member states. Some argue that the EU has set a new precedent for regional organizations to participate at the UN.³⁴

Given the difficulty in adopting Charter amendments or amending protocols to allow regional representation in the Security Council, Nicoletta Pirozzi and Natalino Ronzitti of Istituto Affari Internazionali suggest creating a kind of observer status for the EU in the Security Council similar to the observer status it has in the GA. Their proposal does not request the right to vote or put forward candidates.³⁵ Other regional organizations that have observer status,

such as the African Union, CARICOM, and the League of Arab States, may be interested in establishing enhanced status as well. One of the key problems with Pirozzi and Ronzitti's proposal is that there is no agreement within the EU that an EU seat on the SC is desirable. The Lisbon Treaty of 2009, meant to enhance the EU's international profile and performance, does not call for a seat for the EU on the SC.

While much can be drawn from the EU model, it is difficult to measure the EU's success at regional representation since only a limited percentage of EU countries are Council members, and therefore voting records are not particularly useful. Prof. Edith Drieskens of KU Leuven argues that coordination in New York between EU countries serving on the Council is fairly informal and more focused on information sharing, while the real decision-making occurs in Brussels.³⁶ The EU, like many other regional organizations, faces the challenge of representing sovereign states with often differing positions.

6. Greater Understanding of and Support for African Perspectives

One of the biggest missed opportunities for reforming the Security Council is supporting African countries in exploring acceptable approaches to reform. With 54 Member States represented in one grouping, potentially making up 42% of the 129 votes needed to pass a General Assembly resolution expanding the Council, Africa is the heavyweight in Security Council reform discussions. The ability of 54 African nations to hold a unified position within the Ezulwini consensus since 2005 is impressive in itself, but recent years have shown the limitations of moving forward for a number of reasons. First, while many countries overlook the importance of a bloc that is 54 countries strong, others are accused of leveraging their economic or political power to pressure African nations with regard to reform. Second, the above-mentioned influence of powerful nations along with internal political tensions hinder the ability of African nations to maintain unity on this issue.

CIC conducted research in Addis Ababa to discuss the issue of Security Council reform with member state

representatives at the African Union as well as African Union officials, UN officials, and think tank experts in order to gain a stronger understanding of the evolution of the African position, impediments to further action within or outside of the Ezulwini consensus, the connection (or lack thereof) with capitals, and potential pathways to reform.

6.1 Africa and Security Council Reform: An Update

At the 22nd Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the African Union held in Addis Ababa on 30-31 January 2014, the Committee of Ten on UN Security Council Reform (C10) submitted its thirteenth report for the period of 12 May 2013 – 21 January 2014. The report provided an update of events from the intergovernmental negotiations (IGN) process on the "Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the United Nations Security Council and other matters related to the Council." The report positively noted the high level of participation in UN Security Council reform discussions during the UN General Assembly last November. Nevertheless, the report argues that the IGN have not moved toward "real negotiations" and cites the lack of agreement among UN member states as the main reason for the slow pace of progress on reform.

The report describes reactions from different member state groupings to the PGA's advisory group's non-paper, including from the C10. Although the C10 was represented in the advisory group through its UN leader, the Permanent Representative of Sierra Leone, the C10 merely took note of the non-paper, arguing first for a focus on the principles of the negotiations and proposing production of an abridged version of the second revision of the negotiation text that could help lead to "real negotiations." Interest was also expressed in working on the third revision of the negotiation text in order to make it more "accurate and a true reflection of all positions," but no explanation is provided as to what this would entail.

As with other recent C10 reports, the thirteenth report took note of convergences with other like-minded groupings, and reflected favorably on more recent collaborations with L69 including a draft resolution based on a non-paper with

which the two groups are currently engaged. CARICOM heads of state have also adopted this draft resolution as their position on reform. The C10 reiterated their support for early reform of the Council via the Common African Position as defined in the Ezulwini Consensus and supported by the Sirte Declaration.

A meeting in Freetown of C10 heads of state and the C10 group members based in Addis Ababa scheduled for late 2013 was postponed due to lack of availability of high-level participants. A new date for the meeting has not been announced.

At the January 2014 AU Summit, President Jacob Zuma of South Africa called for a retreat of foreign ministers to review the Ezulwini Consensus. According to sources, the AU Chairperson supported the idea and no AU Member States spoke for or against. The suggestion was formulated into a decision, which was joined to the draft decision prepared by the C10. There was no debate about the decision to hold a retreat at the Summit, however, the suggestion came as a surprise to both AU and UN member states and stirred debate both in Addis Ababa and New York.

6.2 Summary of Research Findings

6.2.1 Frequency of Discussions on UN Security Council Reform

The C10 members at the African Union discuss the issue of Security Council reform with some regularity. In 2013, foreign ministers of C10 countries agreed to provide funding and logistical support to the C10 in Addis Ababa, further strengthening the group's convening role. The wider AU membership, meanwhile, primarily discusses the issue leading up to and during AU summits and the adoption of C10 reports. Capacity issues and prioritization of immediate security concerns are reasons behind the lack of engagement on the issue at the AU. Nevertheless, AU officials noted that Security Council reform is an issue of high interest in Addis Ababa, with particular focus on the veto.

AU Assembly Decisions on the issue generally highlight the role of C10 permanent representatives to the UN on the issue of UN Security Council reform, and many AU interlocutors note that decision-making on the subject is based in New York. However, in a 2011 AU Assembly decision,³⁷ the organization highlighted the importance of C10 permanent representatives working closely with both other African permanent representatives to the UN and the African Union to build support for the Common African Position.³⁸

6.2.2 Views on the Prospects of Reform

Perspectives ranged from optimism about progress to be made by 2015 to the more common, skeptical view that reform is not likely in this lifetime. A number of reasons behind the slow pace of reform were cited, including the low level of interest among P5 members. The P3's³⁹ expectation, that reform be country-specific, is seen by some as a challenge to Africa's position. The UK and France are seen as more flexible, their support for Africa was noted in several conversations, but their appetite for reform was also questioned. Several UfC members were pointed out as seeking to block membership of other potential new permanent members.

It is understood that there is general agreement on the need for reform, particularly in terms of improved representation for Africa, but there is widespread skepticism about whether different groupings will be able to reach common ground on both process and substance of reform. To improve prospects for reform, continued engagement is generally seen as important. Some argued that the failure of the Security Council to function, as some noted was the case in Syria, might create the necessary impetus to push forward reform.

6.2.3 African Unity – Changes Over Time and the Future of Ezulwini

Most interlocutors did not see significant changes in African Unity on the issue of Security Council reform since 2005. However, many noted that the landscape has changed in terms of which countries would be likely candidates for permanent seats on the Council. Some cited recent

events in Egypt and its suspension from AU activities as reasons behind South Africa's current push to rethink the Common African Position. Some speculated that South Africa might be interested in working more closely with G4. The decision by eleven African Union members to also join the L69 group, while viewed critically by some C10 members at first, is not seen as a division within the African group, as the L69 position is not considered to be contradictory to Ezulwini. In fact, L69 has made shifts toward the African position by defining their stance on the veto and this has been noted positively by the C10. It was noted that not all African countries are equally committed to the African position, and there is significant variance within the African group, with some countries questioning the extent to which the African position is serving national versus continent-wide interests.

Opinions on the request to review Ezulwini at a ministerial retreat ranged. Some key players were not aware of the decision and South Africa did not consult about it with any of the member states interviewed in advance of the 2014 summit. Some African states, including some C10 members, were open minded about the possibility of a retreat, expressing the need to recalibrate expectations in Africa or build on the momentum from engagement with L69. Others see it as a self-serving action from South Africa and a threat to the responsibilities entrusted to the C10.

Most African states see the importance of maintaining Ezulwini, since it was a decision taken by the African Union as a whole, but see it as a position that could be adjusted, refined, or built upon as necessary. Experts on the African Union see a general sense of frustration, criticism of the C10 for not facilitating more progress, and an interest in reviewing the African position. It was expressed that the AU in general has difficulty making hard decisions. However, interlocutors did not question whether the C10 should continue to represent Africa's voice under Sierra Leone's leadership and there was a fairly strong agreement that Africa should remain united on this issue.

The idea of two AU seats with longer-term rotation was said to have some appeal among the membership. However, only academics discussed this as a prospect. Among AU

member states the option was deemed less viable. Some AU member state representatives spoke positively about the possibility of intermediate models potentially as a de facto permanent model, but one that needed more clarity. Although the issue had not gained much traction in Addis Ababa, the idea could have potential if negotiated and adjusted.

6.2.4 Key Players in Africa

Key players in Africa were said to be those who have a particular interest in gaining a permanent seat on the Council. South Africa and Nigeria were most often noted as such states. Egypt is still seen as a key player, despite the current situation. Other countries mentioned include Ethiopia, Kenya, and Algeria. Libya was noted as an important player, as Qaddafi had major influence on the Sirte Declaration.

According to sources, most African states mentioned reform in their summit statements. Some interlocutors questioned whether South Africa truly agrees with Ezulwini and whether Egypt actually wants reform. Others argued that the relationship between South Africa and Nigeria has been weaker recently, with diverging views on key issues for Africa, which could have an affect on African unity on reform. Countries that are less likely to have a seat on the Council are said to be less interested in the issue of reform, and prefer the safe route of maintaining the African position.

6.2.5 Influence from Non-African Countries and Collaboration

Most interlocutors noted that non-African countries seek to influence Security Council reform discussions in Africa, particularly in advance of AU summits. Ahead of summits, the C10 experiences high levels of interest in their position from the L69, UfC, G4, and other groupings. Countries from these groups are said to send envoys just before AU summits to promote their positions or attempt to persuade African countries to change their positions. The role of France in influencing francophone countries in Africa was highlighted. Western powers are said to discuss the issue of Security Council reform through diplomatic

presences in African capitals. However, the P3 are not working together closely on Council reform issues in Addis Ababa the way that they are in New York. China's firm position against new permanent members, along with its simultaneous strong economic and political influence in Africa, was noted repeatedly. Domestic politics is viewed as a key driver of action or inaction in regards to Security Council reform.

The C10's collaboration with L69 has received positive responses from African countries, and L69 is seen as the group that has engaged most with Africa recently. According to the C10, the L69 position is seen as increasingly acceptable to Africa.

Some see room for possible collaboration with other groupings based on mutual interest in expansion and working methods improvement. An inclusive, participatory process for collaboration was seen to help facilitate further cooperation. African countries expect the IGN in New York to be the site of collaboration between the African group and other groupings.

A number of African representatives pointed out the importance of continued engagement among African countries in order to support African interests. Some suggested further financial support for C10 meetings or stronger internal support, such as capacity building from African states, to back potential UNSC members.

6.2.6 Limiting the Veto

A number of countries emphasized that limiting the use of the veto, as was suggested by France, would not address Africa's concerns about the veto. However, some described the French proposal as appealing and a way to reach common ground among the wider membership. The proposal was described as a move in the direction of democracy and good governance, and it was said that the veto should be needed less over time.

There was widespread doubt as to whether the P3 would ever accept such restrictions, but some said the proposal should be submitted to the C10 for review and discussion.

An academic summed up his concerns about placing limitations on the veto, saying "the Security Council is a political body, with political influence, including what does or does not constitute genocide or crimes against humanity." Another expert, Melaku Muluaem of the Ethiopian Institute for Peace and Development, has described a more radical approach, suggesting a decentralization of the veto power in which the AU would have a collective veto in situations on its own continent, and the UNSC would not.⁴⁰

6.3 Themes and Initial Analysis

6.3.1 The A3 and Africa's Non-permanent Membership

It was widely believed that the current set up of two-year non-permanent membership on the Council is not working effectively. Lack of human and financial capacity at African Permanent Missions to the UN were cited as impediments to efficient functionality on the Council and difficulty with the fast pace of work on the Council for non-permanent members. One interlocutor described non-permanent members as "tourists" and said that by the time they learn how to be effective Council members, their term is nearly finished.

Efforts to unite the three African non-permanent members on the Council, and branding them as the "A3," came up frequently and were viewed favorably. According to sources, the idea of the A3 is to amplify Africa's unified voice on the council, encouraging countries to represent the continent and not only national interests. Efforts to build capacity at the AU observer mission to the UN are a part of this endeavor, which also seeks to increase the A3's level of caucusing and build institutional memory.

A ministerial High-Level Seminar on *Peace and Security in Africa with a view to Assisting Incoming African Members on the UN Security Council in Preparing to Address Peace and Security Issues on the Continent* was held in Algiers in December 2013. The meeting was an early step toward uniting the A3. Some other issues that emerged were strengthening the relationship between the AU and AU observer Mission in New York, and the need to address the

absence of African penholders for various issues on the Security Council, particularly those pertaining to Africa. This brought to light capacity issues and the relationship between the AU Peace and Security Council and UNSC. There is a notion that, although African issues dominate the Security Council agenda, Africa is not sufficiently consulted. The effort to unite and strengthen the A3 on the Council is seen as a necessary step and a long-term process that has just begun.

Some interlocutors speculated that most countries in Africa do not have much to gain from Council expansion and therefore South Africa is frustrated with the Common African Position. If non-permanent members could show that they are acting on behalf of the continent and with a more unified African voice, this might give non-permanent member African countries incentives to approach Council reform with more fervor.

The idea of permanent, rotating African seats with a longer-term rotation has some appeal among African countries. However, P3 countries do not support regional representation of seats. Strengthening the A3 could be a step toward more regional coordination on the Council, which would be necessary to make the possibility of regional seats more palatable in the long term.

Concerns with the approach of strengthening the A3 include regional differences within Africa, and the complicated, time-consuming process of developing a unified approach. African non-permanent members can also be influenced by the P5, and this is likely to continue even with a stronger A3. If the AU can strengthen the voice of their three seats and have an active permanent secretariat in New York, it could create a stronger African presence on the Council. Africa could improve their prospects for this approach by only endorsing Security Council candidates that support this model.

6.3.2 Flexibility on Ezulwini

The C10's lack of response at the 2014 summit meeting when the retreat to review Ezulwini was suggested by South Africa was likely caused by two issues: C10 countries were not consulted and therefore did not anticipate the

call for a retreat. Therefore, they had not discussed the possibility amongst themselves. Furthermore, they were not all represented at the head of state level and would need to consult with leadership in capitals. While the C10 formally holds strong to Ezulwini in its current state, even the most cautious C10 members seem open-minded about the retreat so long as C10 is consulted and central to the planning process. The retreat will be informal and at the ministerial level in order to quell concerns about a possible parallel process. The lack of consultation with C10 is a point of unease for some, which will need to be remedied to gain the group's support going forward.

Academics, AU officials, and member state representatives alike generally agree that African unity on the issue of reform remains important. However, interviews revealed some openness to change, including further collaboration with L69 and exploration of intermediate options.

6.3.3 Gaining Traction in Capitals and Creative Approaches to Reform

When asked how the issue of Security Council reform could gain more traction in capitals, interviewees advanced several innovative approaches to reform as well as ideas on applying lessons learned from other multilateral executive bodies. One academic expert thought lessons could be learned for Security Council reform from the AU Peace and Security Council set up, which involves 3-year and 2-year term seats that are regionally based and renewable immediately at the end of the term. He pointed out that Western Africa has reached a kind of consensus that has involved re-electing Nigeria for the three-year term seat for the last decade. In effect, it is a de facto permanent seat for Nigeria.

Another academic interviewed argued that African influence on the Security Council could minimize the occurrence of proxy wars in Africa. Increasing understanding about various benefits of African presence on the Council could encourage capitals to further engage in the A3 collaboration as well as the issue of reform.

A member state representative highlighted the successful campaign for debt forgiveness⁴¹ as a model for building

a strong coalition to address the issue of Council reform. It was also suggested that Africa could present a text for negotiation, which has been requested by many member states both African and non-African, in order to gain more ownership of the process.

6.3.4 Broader UN reform

Several interlocutors argued that Security Council reform should be tied to the much needed, broader UN reform efforts, including GA revitalization. An analysis of the common factors obstructing UN reform, could help frame the issue of Security Council reform. The significance of 2015 as the ten-year anniversary of the 2005 World Summit as well as the 50th anniversary of the last reform of the Council was brought up several times as a potential goal for achieving steps toward reform.

III. Next Steps: Potential Approaches in the Lead-Up to 2015

Skepticism from both key players and leading foreign policy experts indicate that prospects for immediate reform remain elusive. Yet the vast majority of member states continue to be committed to finding potential options for reform. As explained in Section I, member states are looking to 2015 as a milestone for progress on UNSC reform. A well-planned approach to reform can build off of the momentum created by the 2015 milestone. This section outlines a number of potential practical steps to help facilitate tangible progress by the 70th anniversary of the UN, 50th anniversary of the last reform of the Council, and ten-year mark after the 2005 World Summit.

1. Conducting Outreach from 2014-2015

Advocates for reform could conduct outreach in order to advance UNSC reform in the following ways:

1.1 Call for Appointment of a Special Envoy or High Level Panel (HLP) on the issue of UNSC reform in preparation for 2015. A Special Envoy or HLP that engages with capitals on the issue of Security Council reform could be tasked with helping Member States streamline their positions in the negotiation text, or advising governments about the political climate based on consultations. A third party that is immersed in the issue can enrich the work of permanent representatives and experts at UN permanent missions in New York by (i) offering an outside perspective of the negotiations and (ii) having the freedom to communicate with governments about creative ideas for possible shifts in policy. A high-level envoy or panel member would be helpful in having the versatility to speak more freely to high-ranking government officials to share perspectives on what could help facilitate reform.

A Special Envoy would be in a good position to build on the work that has been done thus far in the IGN, rather than starting afresh, which is a more common approach for HLPs. A Special Envoy could benefit from the insight of an international contact group made up of dignitaries supporting his or her work.

This recommendation also has practical benefits. The office of a Special Envoy or HLP could offer logistical support and help maintain the institutional memory for the issue of Security Council reform. Currently, records of the reform issues are maintained only in the office of the Chair at the Permanent Mission of Afghanistan, with no support from the Secretariat.

A special envoy or HLP could help bridge the disconnection between UNHQ and member state capitals through building awareness, interest, and activity around the issue of UNSC reform. As the Chair of the IGN noted⁴² and CIC survey results have reiterated, it is crucial to fully engage capitals in the negotiations and reinforce the political links to capitals. The lack of connection between capitals and discussions at UN headquarters manifests itself in two ways:

- Member state representatives in the negotiating room are often given strict instructions that do not allow space for movement or compromise, which are crucial to any negotiation process. Therefore, many member state representatives have no choice but to repeat old statements, turning the negotiations into a predictable, scripted charade. Many representatives have been working based on outdated instructions that have not been revisited in years.
- Detached from negotiations in New York, leadership in capitals can be unaware of how their positions contribute to the deadlock in the negotiating room, and do not have the same impetus to rethink positions as those engaged in negotiations.

These circumstances suggest that capitals are, understandably, more influenced by their own constituencies than discussions in New York. Therefore, one way to address the lack of movement on reform is for a Special Envoy to encourage public debates and engage in track III diplomacy in capitals in order to generate domestic interest. Then track II meetings could be held to discuss the substance of potential proposals.

1.2 Call for a High-Level Meeting (HLM) on UNSC reform in September 2015 to help raise interest and activity on the issue. The meeting could be linked with the 2015 ten-year anniversary of the 2005 World Summit, and 70th anniversary of the UN. The IGN Chair in his July 2012 letter suggested the idea of a HLM in order to help deepen involvement with capitals. A HLM would facilitate collaboration between capitals and New York, encouraging member states to review or rethink their positions in preparation. Depending on the success of the HLM, the membership could consider regular high-level meetings on Security Council reform to assure a more consistent involvement of stakeholders in capitals. The Special Envoy or HLP would be central in preparations for the HLM in 2015. One challenge of linking Security Council reform meeting with the 2015 anniversary is that the agenda for the 2015 General Assembly High Level Meetings is already crowded, and there may be some push back from member states about potential distractions from work on Sustainable Development Goals, which are a planned focus.

1.3 Call for Expert-Level Meetings on UNSC reform in the lead-up to September 2015. With an issue as contentious as UNSC reform, member state diplomats at the expert-level have little authority for suggesting changes to improve working documents such as Rev3, the Advisory Group's Non Paper, or Rev3's shorter paper. Experts need to be given more authority to work under the guidance of their respective permanent representatives, to discuss language amongst themselves and negotiate possible streamlining of language as they do with other negotiations and resolutions. Member states could task teams of expert-level diplomats from their respective capitals to engage with their counterparts in New York both from their own missions and from missions of different reform groupings. These teams could make collective suggestions for merging language and even drafting resolutions. These suggestions could then be made through normal diplomatic channels, through UN permanent representatives to leadership in capitals. Expert-level meetings across reform groupings would help to build confidence between reform groupings, as there is currently little trust between groups on this issue.

2. Focusing on Regional Dynamics and Regional Coordination on the Council

There are two main ways that regional dynamics could be leveraged to promote reform of the Security Council. First, if regional or continental groupings, such as the AU or EU, are encouraged to further solidify their positions and take unified actions, this could challenge or complement some of the existing UNSC reform groupings. A shift in numbers of countries supporting specific reform proposals based on regional consensus decisions could be enough to sway potential votes in one direction or another, and the sheer weight of numbers within regional organizations could be leveraged to help gain the necessary two-thirds majority of votes. Second, if other regional organizations seek increased regional coordination within the Council, as the EU and AU have begun to do, that could affect the dynamics in the UNSC and pave the way for discussions on new, creative, regional-based approaches to reform in the long term, such as new voting structures based on populations, country sizes, and economics within regions.

While a structure of regional representation⁴³ for the Council is idealistic under present conditions, regional organizations could play a role in increasing regional roles on the Security Council, and potentially build toward a long-term vision of a new structure for a reformed Council. Some benefits to increased regional coordination on the Council include:

- Increased focus on regional coordination, including regional consensus for non-permanent seats, can be implemented in combination with other approaches to reform. In fact, it could promote compromise rather than competition within regions in discussions on Security Council reform. As discussions are now, regional tensions play out in many situations where countries formulate positions based on blocking more powerful regional neighbors from gaining more recognition or power in an enlarged council. The result is the perpetuation of the status quo.
- With more focus on regional dynamics, reform-minded countries could engage further with the C10 and other African countries. African group support is important

for any reform and is often underestimated. An approach to reform that highlights the role of regional organizations has the potential for gaining support from Africa. African unity is preserved and strengthened through the amplification of the African voice on the Council, such as through supporting A3 collaboration.

- Increasing regional coordination is a more realistic approach than expansion models because (i) no immediate changes to the charter are required, and (ii) it does not require the support of the P5, and does not require a vote, as it relates to how member states choose to behave on the Council.
- The participation of non-permanent members on the Council often suffers from capacity and resource issues. With the massive funds required for campaigning it can be difficult for member states to afford staffing and resources once elected to the Council. Collective support of member states to sustain regional offices at the UN could benefit non-permanent members, offering necessary resources and capacity for effective participation on the Council. Regional offices would also increase the exchange of information, lessons learned, and institutional memory between members of regional organizations, which would allow countries to be more effective members of the Council.
- It encourages open discussions about possible restructuring for the Security Council in the long-term, involving rotating regional seats. Although such a restructuring is unrealistic currently, it merits inclusion in discussions as it is considered by many scholars as a better way to represent an increasingly multipolar world.⁴⁴ UfC members have shown some interest in a more regional focus to reform.⁴⁵ Therefore, discussions to explore regional coordination on the Council may provide opportunities for much needed dialogue across reform groupings.

Still, increased regionalism on the Council will not necessarily translate into a transformation of Council dynamics. There are some limitations to this approach:

- While the AU and EU have already taken steps toward increased regionalism on the Council, other regional organizations are less clearly defined, and are far from creating necessary regional unity for collective action on the Council.
- Regional organizations can have deep internal rifts that would make the process of formulating unified regional positions and decisions difficult. This is even the case with the EU and AU. Furthermore, it would encourage rethinking of the current regional UN groupings, some of which have little common regional interest.
- Capacity issues are also a factor. Further funding and support for regional offices at the UN would be required. Further logistical support and training from the Secretariat could benefit regional missions as needed.
- Increased regional coordination requires the interest and political will of member states within each region to work together in a more unified fashion. If the concept is forced from the outside, it could be seen as an unfair expectation of regional organizations to act with one voice while other states evade this expectation. Increased regional coordination can be seen as an optional tool for amplifying regional voices rather than a new structure for all member states, and potentially a very long-term approach to comprehensive reform.

3. Engaging in Discussions about Limiting the Use of the Veto

As part of preparation for 2015, member states should engage in emerging discussions about limiting the veto. The French proposal has generated interest both among member states and civil society about potential limitations for P5 use of the veto. While there has not yet been serious involvement from African countries on this issue, the research in Section II(6) shows that there is interest within Africa and potential for further engagement. Ongoing discussions on the veto, particularly those that include both Africa and P5 countries, can help build momentum for reform progress in 2015.

A different channel of communication with the P5 on issues of reform in general, such as holding reassurance meetings, would help benefit discussions on UNSC reform issues, including the veto. This would allow the P5 and other member states to have frank, open discussions about how expansion or veto issues would affect national interests of P5 members.

4. Exploring Potential Models for Reform

Member states should explore different reform models in the lead-up to 2015 with the aim of a draft resolution for discussion or endorsement at the HLM in September 2015.

A lesson from the playbook of Ambassador Ismail Razali, the 1996-7 PGA and then Chair of the Open-Ended Working Group, could be useful for formulating a reform model. Although Razali's plan for Security Council reform was not successful, his use of framework resolutions could be a helpful tool for future reform models. See textbox on page 8 for more details on Razali's plan.

Multi-stage processes like Razali's could be used in various approaches. A working document that outlines a step-by-step approach to reform, building toward a broader draft resolution, could garner the widest possible support from the membership. Below are outlines for two such working documents, which could be drafted by member states in tandem. The positions in Rev 3 could be encompassed in these two separate working documents, one on expansion in both categories, and the other on a third category of seats. Both documents could be designed to be converted easily into draft resolutions, leaving blank spaces to be determined at a specified later date. This of course leaves a broad spectrum of decisions to be made during each stage of the step-by-step approach. Member States should collaborate on both working documents to shape them into draft resolutions that can garner the widest possible acceptance. As a member state-driven process, developed on the basis of Rev3, which is inclusive of all member state positions, this approach would avoid some of the pitfalls of Razali's plan.

Either or both working documents could ultimately be turned into draft resolutions and put to vote in the General Assembly, depending on the level of support seen in consultations and IGN/General Assembly meetings. Consultations on both documents could be conducted simultaneously. If the details of one model are highly contested, but there is clearly support from two-thirds of the membership for that model, an aspirational resolution could be passed in the GA, stating that “the General Assembly will pass a resolution to amend the Charter and expand the Security Council through...” either “... discussions on expansion in both Categories” or “... creation of a third category of membership,” depending which model has the most support. This will push all member states to fully engage with one approach to reform going forward. Suggestions for the development of both of these working documents are described below.

4.1 Expansion in Both Categories

With the upcoming retreat revisit Ezulwini, there is potential space to explore options for adjusting the L69/CARICOM model accordingly. Depending on the direction taken from Africa’s discussions, a resulting model could be a working document that results in a multi-stage plan. Rev3 could be used as the basis to ensure that all member state positions that support expansion in both categories are included in the working document. Once there is general agreement that these positions are reflected, negotiations on that document could narrow it down to a multi-stage draft resolution. The first stage could involve (i) deciding to add new permanent and non-permanent members (ii) selecting which member states would be candidates for those seats (iii) determining a date and other details for review of the veto and (iv) adopting a resolution to implement the decision through a Charter amendment. One potential approach to this model which may be particularly helpful if there is difficulty gaining support from some P5 members, would be including a confidence-vote, which would allow member states elect new permanent members after a specified amount of time, allowing them to be voted out of permanent membership through a non-confidence vote.

Building a multi-stage model for reform based on expansion in both categories, that does not specify immediate extension of veto rights could be challenged by African countries. Without a significant shift in the Common African Position, it may be more difficult to gain support from Africa because many African states are critical of those who are viewed as straying from the Common African Position. However, aspirant permanent members from Africa, such as South Africa or Nigeria, could justify Ezulwini compliance through plans to address the veto in later stages. Africa would not be expected to change its stance on veto, but could show compromise in its willingness to address the veto issue after categories of membership are determined and new members are selected.

There are a number of other risks in promoting a model of reform involving expansion in both categories of membership. Because of sensitivities in Africa about outside influences, non-African member states should support African leadership, particularly from Sierra Leone, in formulating any such model. Any reform draft should take the African common position into account in accordance with decisions made at the upcoming retreat on Ezulwini. Non-African states must maintain a cautious balance in regards to the retreat, which should focus on supporting African states in refining their position. Many countries will attempt to influence the outcome, but if seen as pressuring, that could have negative effects on the prospect for a change in position.

If the outcome of the retreat reveals that there is little appetite for a shift in the African position in regards to veto, it would prove more difficult to move forward with this model. The US, China, and Russia are not likely to accept a model with plans to extend the veto and are even less likely to accept one that involves a goal of eliminating the veto altogether. Therefore it may be difficult to reach agreement on details of the veto review. However, if there is broad member state agreement on the first phase of the model, the review on veto could be discussed at a later date. The change in political climate that emerges from the resolutions in the two initial stages could potentially shift the balance with regard to veto in the long term.

4.2 A Third Category of Longer-Term Seats

To garner the widest possible support from the membership, member states should also explore the possibility of expansion through a third category of seats. If member states from different groupings could work together to draft a working document, outlining the range of different options for intermediate models, those which create a third category of seats, that could serve as the basis for negotiation toward a draft resolution.

This working document could be based on positions presented in Rev3, including the range of member state positions. For example, in the Categories of Membership section, positions are grouped together under calls for “Enlargement in intermediary/ intermediate/ interim/ longer term/third category.”⁴⁶ Positions under that heading that support these models of expansion could be encompassed through a range, such as “Enlargement in a new category of non-permanent seats of [3 to 12] years.” The next section could give a range of options as to the extent to which non-permanent seats are immediately renewable. While UfC’s current position only supports immediate renewability for two-year seats (and only for two re-elections), the group may be more willing to compromise if other member states show new willingness to explore the intermediate option. The review clause has broad support and should be included in the working document as a means for evaluating the interim arrangement and addressing outstanding issues including potential limitations on P5 use of the veto. After agreeing on a draft resolution with the contours of an intermediate model of reform, member states could negotiate on the specifics, including the details of the review clause, in consultations or subsequent IGN meetings.

UfC countries, under Italy’s leadership, have shown impressive capacity for mobilizing against progress on reform that is deemed contrary to their position on reform. There is no reason these countries will change their strategy unless approached differently about reform. A draft resolution on intermediate models would require UfC’s support and involvement, and could be a way to find common ground between those supporting intermediate

approaches and member states that are open to creative approaches for increasing their role on the Council.

One of the key benefits of this approach is that it will allow for focused discussions on a specific text, which can help negotiations progress toward real give and take. Furthermore, as Russia notes in Rev3, there is a need for clarity on interim models, and discussions on a working document or draft resolution on the intermediate model would help to establish the scope of such a model.

One drawback of this approach is that if G4 and like minded countries support the creation of a third category of seats, it could risk the appearance of straying from their position. To address this, it could be posed as a second option and a stepping-stone approach, leading to potential permanent membership, or de facto permanent membership through immediate re-election. An alternative approach to reform that still maintains the ultimate goal of serving on the Council permanently, but better recognize the current political climate. A third category of longer-term seats that allows member states to run for immediate re-election can give the membership an opportunity to witness a larger Council with longer term seats in action, putting them in a better position to assess the Council’s effectiveness after an initial adjustment period. There may be potential for a shift, at such a time, making some of the longer-term seats permanent. Chances of such a shift are much more likely after a successful expansion of the Council with new longer-term seats than they are now, when some of the membership and the P3 in particular are skeptical about the efficiency of an enlarged Council.

For Africa as well, the intermediate model could be seen as a stepping stone, rather than straying from first choice positions favoring expansion in both categories. This would give an opportunity to showcase an enlarged Council in action with longer-term African seats chosen by Africa. However, the intermediate model would be a hard sell in Africa unless talks on Ezulwini really break up the common position, which is not likely to happen quickly. El Salvador and Cuba are also likely to have strong hesitations about the creation of a third category of seats, according to their positions in Rev3, which express opposition to such an approach.⁴⁷

Initial discussions on the idea of the working document should be conducted in informal retreats or conferences to take stock of member state perspectives on the possibilities, and explore creative approaches with the input of experts from civil society and academia. Any resulting models or approaches should then be taken to the IG. France and the UK⁴⁸ as well as Liechtenstein⁴⁹ have developed intermediate models that could be useful for bridging positions within this approach, and should be consulted closely in the drafting process. UfC's perspective is also important to incorporate into any intermediate model. Utilizing this moment in which France has become more vocal on the veto issue could help engage France and the UK on intermediate models. With more involvement from these more reform minded P5 countries, a framework resolution as described above on intermediate models would have a much better chance of gaining support.

Recommendations 1-4 can be implemented in combination, and in fact movement in one area can benefit progress in another. For example, building a broad coalition across reform groupings to discuss the issue of veto can set precedent for discussions amongst member states that have not previously worked together on the issue of UNSC reform. This is an effective way to build trust and promote frank discussions between member states of different groupings outside of formal processes. It is only with open discussions across reform groupings that models for expansion can garner the necessary support to be developed into resolutions in the General Assembly.

Conclusion

Without any reform, the Security Council may lose legitimacy, other multilateral institutions may gain relevance, and decentralization of international peace and security could result. The above-mentioned suggestions are meant to contribute to discussions on how to strengthen the Security Council and maintain its relevance. These suggestions also have practical implications in regards to efficient functionality at the UN; better coordination and unity within regional organizations can help improve the work of Council members from those regions. Furthermore, expansion of the Council, whether in the permanent or a new category of membership, will allow member states elected for those seats to shift focus from time-consuming, expensive election campaigns at the UN, and better focus on and contribute to the work of the Council.

All member states, at least in their public positions, express an interest in reforming the Security Council. Even member states with the most conservative approaches articulate two sentiments in common: first, frustration that the process is not moving more quickly (if it is perceived to be moving at all), and second: skepticism that any real change will come at least in the short term. That pessimism in fact exacerbates the inertia of the reform process, contributing to a vicious cycle in which frustration is unable to be transformed into a motivator for action. Without the necessary political will from member states, reform remains out of reach. There is no magic formula for solving this complex puzzle in a way that will garner support from the entire membership. That is why it is particularly useful to look at the short-term ways that could set the stage to facilitate reform in the medium- to long-term. Building on the momentum around the 2015 milestone is an important opportunity for member states interested in making tangible progress on reform.

Annex

Overview of Member State Groupings

Cross-Regional Groupings

The **Arab Group**, which represents the Arab League on this issue at the UN, holds a position in Rev3, but it is only recently, with Saudi Arabia's rejection of a Council seat and emphasis on the Council's failure to resolve conflicts in the Middle East, that the Arab League amplified its call for reform. The Arab group has spoken with Kuwait as its spokesperson during the current General Assembly session for the first time in recent years.

A letter sent to the Chair of IGN in January 2010 from The League of Arab States, reiterated the League's demand for "a permanent Arab representation in any future expansion in the category of permanent membership of the Security Council."

The **Group of Four (G4)** consists of Brazil, Germany, India, and Japan. The G4 model consists of expansion in both categories of membership and reform of the working methods. Brazil and India are also members of the L69 group. The G4 has shaken up the debate on Security Council reform twice in the last decade. First in 2005 and again in 2011, both times pushing forward reform models involving expansion in both categories. In 2011 G4 representatives reported that their attempts to collect written signatures on a draft "short resolution" circulated amongst the membership received more than 80 signatures.⁵⁰ While their efforts fell shy of the required two-thirds support in the General Assembly, as the resolution was never brought to vote, it elicited strong responses from other member state groupings, particularly UfC members who were against the resolution, and renewed interest in the debate.⁵¹

L69⁵² consists of 42 countries. L69 defines itself as "a diverse group of developing countries from Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia and the Pacific, who are united by a common cause – to achieve, lasting and comprehensive reform of the UN Security Council."⁵³ In 2012 the group more clearly defined its position, bringing

it into line with the Common African Position by clarifying that veto rights should be extended to new permanent seats. L69 also supports a non-permanent seat for small island developing states across all regions. Eleven countries from the African Union, eleven from CARICOM, and two CARICOM observers are in the L69 group.

The **Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)** has emphasized that regional groups should have a greater role in determining their representation on the Council. They do not speak in the IGN as a group, but hold a position in the negotiation text in regards to "adequate representation" of Islamic Ummah on the Council.⁵⁴

Uniting for Consensus (UfC) does not have a public listing of their membership, but is said to contain 12 key countries: Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Italy, Malta, Mexico, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Spain, and Turkey. China and Indonesia participate in expert level meetings of UfC.⁵⁵ UfC's position supports new non-permanent seats and/or longer-term and renewable seats, redistributed by region. It is the only group with a proposal that does not include expansion in the permanent category of membership.⁵⁶

The P5

The five permanent members (**P5**) of the Security Council are divided on the issue of Security Council reform, and are informally referred to, unlike in other circumstances, as the **P3** (China, Russia, and the US) and the **P2** (France and the UK). Regarding enlargement, the US supports modest expansion in both categories of membership "in principle," requires that all new members are country-specific (not regionally-based), and is against any expansion of veto powers. Russia expresses openness to exploring the interim model of expansion and to extending veto powers to possible new permanent members, but emphasizes that the veto should only be discussed after new members have been selected. Russia and the US support maintaining veto prerogatives for current permanent members. China's position in Rev3 supports expansion to address imbalance in its structure, but only makes a general statement regarding categories of membership, stating that member states further engage on the divisive issue.⁵⁷

France and the UK hold a shared position in Rev3 supporting expansion in both categories of membership as well as supporting intermediate models with longer-term seats and a review to convert those seats into permanent ones.⁵⁸ Although France and the UK have more progressive positions on UNSC reform than other P5 members, they have not sought to take the lead on issues relating to reform in recent years until the French proposal on limiting the veto in the current GA session.

The ACT Group

Accountability, Coherence, and Transparency (ACT):

The ACT group does not speak in IGN meetings as a group and wishes to remain outside of the process of comprehensive Security Council reform. However, ACT has become the key group on working methods reform since it emerged in May 2013, and builds upon the work of the Small Five (S5), which preceded it. The group consists of 22 small and mid-sized countries, and is currently coordinated by Switzerland. These include: Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Hungary, Ireland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Maldives, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania (observer), and Uruguay.⁵⁹ Some members of ACT have taken a particular interest in the French proposal for limiting use of the veto, and may choose to build on France's suggestion.

Regional Organizations and Regional Dynamics

The **African Group** (represented by Sierra Leone on behalf of C-10) is the largest of the regional organizations dealing with Security Council reform. The African group is united by its common position, the "Ezulwini Consensus" and Sirte Declaration. Ezulwini proposes at least two new permanent seats for Africa with all prerogatives and privileges enjoyed by other permanent members, and five non-permanent seats on the Security Council, with candidates to be decided by the African Union and elected by the General Assembly.

There is widespread agreement among member states that there is a need to improve African representation on the Council. It is one of the few reform matters about which

member states appear to unanimously agree, matched in popularity only with concepts as general as "there is a need for reform." Regionally based new permanent seats are broadly accepted for Africa amongst the membership, with states to be determined by the African group.

The African group is known to have internal divisions that have kept the group from moving beyond or building upon the Ezulwini consensus. While their regional collaboration has given them the power of a strong collective voice, individual countries within the group and the group itself are weighed down by the obligation to remain united among its 54 member countries. Any changes in position would have to be agreed upon by all, and tensions arise when certain countries appear too close with other groupings or are viewed as straying from the consensus positions. (This has placed limits on South Africa's collaboration with G4/L69/CARICOM.)

Belgium and the Netherlands generally speak as a group in IGN meetings, are active in reform discussions, and are informally referred to as BENL. Their position holds preference for G4's model of expansion in both categories of membership, but BENL has also expressed openness to exploring different models of expansion including intermediate approaches.

CARICOM has become more active in recent years on the issue of Security Council reform. A communiqué was issued after the 24th Inter-Sessional Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Caribbean Community on 18-19 February 2013. The communiqué highlighted support for the African position, and rather than emphasizing regional representation for CARICOM, calls for the inclusion of a non-permanent seat for Small Island Developing States (SIDS) across all regions. CARICOM circulated the communiqué along with a draft resolution to this effect. CARICOM's draft resolution is similar to an L69 draft resolution from 2012, which was less widely circulated. The CARICOM draft resolution calls for additional seats to be elected by the General Assembly with six new permanent seats, including two for Africa and to be determined by Africa, two for Asia, one for Latin America, and Caribbean states, and one for Western Europe and other states. It calls for five new non-permanent seats that are regionally divided, and a non-

permanent seat for Small Island and Developing States across all regions, which would be coordinated by regional groups to ensure regular representation of SIDS.⁶⁰

CARICOM specifies that seats for SIDS should be rotating and has also noted that the role of developing countries should be emphasized in both categories of membership (permanent and non-permanent). In addition to emphasizing seats for SIDS, CARICOM continues to urge the membership to take into account under represented regions such as Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The resolution's mention of regional groups coordinating representation for SIDS and Africa nominating representatives highlights CARICOM's emphasis on the role of regional groups. CARICOM (and L69) appear to be seeking convergences with the African position by calling for seats for Africa and the extension of veto power to new permanent members. Since its circulation in February 2013, there has not been any visible movement on the draft resolution.

Eastern European Group of states eligible for non-permanent membership of the Security Council holds a position in Rev3 that existing regional groups should be maintained. It also requests at least one additional non-permanent seat for the Eastern European group if non-permanent membership is expanded (A/59/723).

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) has spoken on this issue for the first time as a group after Saudi Arabia rejected its Security Council seat and has begun to show more interest in the issue.

Pacific Small Island Developing States (Pacific SIDS) includes 12 countries represented by Papua New Guinea. Pacific SIDS call for allocation "within the existing group structures" for SIDS.⁶¹ They have significant overlap with the L69 group.

The **European Union (EU)** does not have a unified position on UNSC reform. EU member state positions on Security Council reform vary greatly, but attempts to behave in a more unified manner at the UN and Security Council could influence more cooperation within the group, which could affect reform progress.

Endnotes

¹Charter of the United Nations, Chapter XVIII: Amendments, Article 108.

²See for example: Ian Birrell, "We Must End This UN 'Paralysis' on Syria," *The Guardian*, September 8, 2013, www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/08/un-paralysis-syria-security-council-russia.

³Laurent Fabius, "A Call for Self-Restraint at the U.N.," *The New York Times*, October 4, 2013, www.nytimes.com/2013/10/04/opinion/a-call-for-self-restraint-at-the-un.html?_r=1&.

⁴For more nuanced speculations about Saudi Arabia's rejection of a non-permanent seat, see Richard Gowan, "Diplomatic Fallout: Saudi Arabia's Security Council Move More Than Just a Stunt," October 21, 2013, www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/13316/diplomatic-fallout-saudi-arabia-s-security-council-move-more-than-just-a-stunt.

⁵Mark LeVine, "On Crimea 'Invasion': Why the UN Veto Has to Go," March 5, 2014, www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2014/03/cremea-invasion-why-un-veto-go-20143554242372959.html.

⁶Letter of the Chair of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, July 25 2012, <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/PDF/Security%20Council%20Reform-PGA%20letter%2027%20July.pdf>

⁷Thomas G. Weiss, "The Illusion of UN Security Council Reform," *The Washington Quarterly* pp. 147-161, Autumn 2003, http://www.iri.org/listado_docs/naciones_unidas/Thomas%20G.%20Weiss%20The%20illusion%20of%20UNSecurity%20Council%20Reform.pdf.

⁸Charter of the United Nations, Article 108, < <https://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter18.shtml>>

⁹Letter of the Chair of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, July 25 2012, 6. <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/PDF/Security%20Council%20Reform-PGA%20letter%2027%20July.pdf>

¹⁰Kara C. McDonald and Stewart M. Patrick, "UN Security Council Enlargement and U.S. Interests," *Council on Foreign Relations*, December 2010, <http://www.cfr.org/international-organizations-and-alliances/un-security-council-enlargement-us-interests/p23363>

¹¹All interviewees participating in this research had the option to remain anonymous.

¹²Letter of the Chair of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, July 25 2012, <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/PDF/Security%20Council%20Reform-PGA%20letter%2027%20July.pdf>

¹³Edith Drieskens, Laura Van Dievel and Yf Reykers, "The EU's search for effective participation at the UN General Assembly and UN Security Council," Ch. 2, Edith Drieskens and Louise G. van Schaik eds, *The EU and Effective Multilateralism: Internal and external reform practices*, Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York, 2014.

¹⁴Spyros Blavoukos and Dimitris Bourantonis, *Chairing Multilateral Negotiations: The Case of the United Nations*, Routledge Research on the United Nations, New York, 2011, 56.

¹⁵Some member states, such as those in the Uniting for Consensus (UfC) group, continue to argue that on an issue of such widespread interest, a consensus decision is more appropriate. General Assembly decisions, letters from the President of the General Assembly, and Chair of the IGN tend to refer to the goal of achieving the "widest possible political support" (as per decision 62/557) from the membership. Rules of procedure require two-thirds majority vote if any resolution is brought to the General Assembly. As the Deputy Permanent Representative of Liechtenstein stated at a 2012 IGN meeting, "we cannot give a de facto veto on this issue to every single delegation. What we need is a political consensus that reflects a very strong majority of Member States, beyond a two-thirds majority, and in particular a majority that will lead to a successful ratification process." < http://www.regierung.li/fileadmin/dateien/botschaften/ny_dokumente/2012-2-21_-_LI_statement_SC_reform_-_UfC_proposal_02.pdf>

¹⁶Letter of the Chair of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, July 25 2012, <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/PDF/Security%20Council%20Reform-PGA%20letter%2027%20July.pdf>

¹⁷Letter to the President of the General Assembly from Chair of IGN, H.E. Ambassador Zahir Tanin, April 20, 2013, <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/67/letters/pdf/Security%20Council%20Reform%20Informals%20-%202012%20April%202013.pdf>

¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁹Lydia Swart and Estelle Perry edited, "Governing & Managing Change at the United Nations: Reform of the Security Council from 1945 to September 2013," Volume 1, September 2013, Center for UN Reform Education, <http://nebula.wsimg.com/d1c5ba495f003b04e7f766a3b570ea28?AccessKeyId=41791172F0E6AB1AA1DC&disposition=0&alloworig=in=1>

²⁰Center for UN Reform Education, "A New Low Point in the Security Council Reform Process: Serious Clashes between the President of the General Assembly and Chair," <http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/501>

²¹See Annex for a full description of member state groupings on UNSC reform

²²Letter from the President of the General Assembly to the Chair of IGN, H.E. Ambassador Zahir Tanin, December 10, 2013, http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/68/pdf/letters/12102013_Security_Council_Reform_Informals-10_December_2013.pdf

²³*Ibid.*

²⁴Committee of Ten on UN Security Council Reform (C10) thirteenth report for the period of 12 May 2013 – 21 January 2014.

²⁵Center for UN Reform Education, "The Advisory Group's Non-Paper: Will it Facilitate Security Council reform?" <http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/509>

²⁶Statement by H.E. Ambassador Maria Luiza Riberio Viotti, Permanent Representative of the Federative Republic of Brazil, <http://www.un.int/brazil/speech/11d-mlrv-round-of-the-intergov-negotiations.html>

²⁷Fabius, *The New York Times*, October 4, 2013

²⁸*Ibid.*

²⁹African responses to the French proposal can be found in more detail in Section II (6.2.6).

³⁰Annex outlines positions of regional organizations on UNSC reform in detail.

³¹See introduction for more details on Saudi Arabia's rejection of a non-permanent seat.

³²Nicoletta Pirozzi and Natalino Ronzitti, "The European Union and the Reform of the UN Security Council: Toward a new regionalism?," *Istituto Affari Internazionali*, 2011, http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/GPFSeminar_FINAL.pdf

³³A/RES/65/276

³⁴*Ibid.*

³⁵*Ibid.*

³⁶Edith Drieskens, "Measuring EU Actorness at the UN Security Council: The EU as a Paragon of Complexity" Ch. 5, F. De Lombaerde et al (eds), *The United Nations and the Regions: Third World Report on Regional Integration*, United Nations University Series on Regionalism 3, Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2012.

³⁷Decisions adopted during the 17th African Union Summit, July 1, 2011, http://summits.au.int/en/sites/default/files/17th%20_SUMMIT_-_DECISIONS_DECLARATIONS_and_RESOLUTIONS_-_eng%20FINAL.pdf

³⁸The clause requesting AU Permanent Representative engagement was removed in the subsequent AU decision at the eighteenth summit, Assembly/AU/Dec.370(XVII), Assembly/AU/Dec.409(XVIII).

³⁹P3 in regards to UNSC reform refers to China, Russia, and the US.

⁴⁰Melaku Muluaem, "Decentralization of veto power and the new world order", *The Reporter*, July 25, 2013, <http://www.thereporterethiopia.com/index.php/opinion/viewpoint/item/761-decentralization-of-veto-power-and-the-new-world-order>

⁴¹See: <http://advocacyinternational.co.uk/featured-project/jubilee-2000>

⁴²Letter of the Chair of the Intergovernmental Negotiations on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters, July 25, 2012, <http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/66/Letters/PDF/Security%20Council%20Reform-PGA%20letter%2027%20July.pdf>

⁴³Structured regional representation should not be confused with the current geographical distribution of the Council. Regional representation involves Council members actively representing regional interests through their participation on the Council

⁴⁴Hans Kochler, F. De Lombaerde et al (eds), *The United Nations and the Regions: Third World Report on Regional Integration*, United Nations University Series on Regionalism Volume 3, Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2012, 88.

⁴⁵See for example, statement by Ambassador Sebastiano Cardi of Italy on behalf of UfC at the IGN on 1 April 2014, http://www.italyun.esteri.it/Rappresentanza_ONU/Menu/Comunicazione/Archivio_News/2014_04_01_PR+Cardi_SC_Riforma.htm

⁴⁶Member states use (and confuse) a range of words to describe a model with a third category of seats. These words all have slightly different meanings, but generally refer to creating a third category of longer-term seats that may or may not be renewable.

⁴⁷Rev3 can be found at http://www.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/UNSC_Reform_Draft_February_2011.pdf

⁴⁸According to the website of the Permanent Mission of France to the UN, "France and the United Kingdom proposed the option of an intermediate reform at the UK-France Summit on 27 March 2008. This could include a new category of seats, with a longer term than that of the members currently elected. On completion of this intermediate period, a review should take place to convert these new seats into permanent seats. France and the United Kingdom renewed their proposal at the UK-France Summit on 6 July 2009."

⁴⁹<http://www.franceonu.org/france-at-the-united-nations/thematic-files/un-reform/security-council-reform/france-at-the-united-nations/thematic-files/un-reform/security-council-reform/article/security-council-reform>>http://www.regierung.li/fileadmin/dateien/botschaften/ny_dokumente/26-02-2010pdf-fl-aussenstelle-newyork-dokumente-reform-sc-intermediatemodel-elements-2010-02-26_01_1_.pdf

⁵⁰Richard Gowan, "Diplomatic Fallout: The Fading Dream of U.N. Security Council," *World Politics Review*, March 4, 2013, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12759/diplomatic-fallout-the-fading-dream-of-u-n-security-council-reform>

⁵¹The Hindu, "Solid support for resolution on UNSC expansion: Puri," January 28, 2012, <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/solid-support-for-resolution-on-uns-c-expansion-puri/article2837740.ece>

⁵²L69 takes its name from draft resolution A/61/L.69 submitted in 2007, drafted by India and submitted by a group of Member States seeking to strengthen the language of the Chair's report and resolution to continue the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council and Other Matters related to the Security Council.

⁵³Statement by Permanent Representative of Jamaica to the United Nations, November 15, 2012, <http://www.un.int/jamaica/67agendaitems117and30.htm>

⁵⁴Rev3

⁵⁵Center for UN Reform Education, "The Advisory Group's Non-Paper: Will it Facilitate Security Council reform?," <http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/509>

⁵⁶Platform for Change, Uniting for Consensus, <http://pfcun.org/ufc.html>

⁵⁷Rev3

⁵⁸Rev3

⁵⁹ACT - the Accountability, Coherence and Transparency Group Better Working Methods for today's UN Security Council, Switzerland Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, August 2013, <http://www.eda.admin.ch/etc/medialib/downloads/edazen/topics/intorg/un/missny/other.Par.0170.File.tmp/ACT%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf>

⁶⁰Center for UN Reform Education, "Draft Resolutions on Security Council Reform: Growing Convergence among Developing Countries?" <http://www.centerforunreform.org/node/496>

⁶¹Statement by H.E. Mr. Robert Aisi, Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea, on behalf of the Pacific Small Island Developing States before the United Nations General Assembly, November 11, 2009, <http://www.pacificsids.org/statements/2010-2011/20101111.pdf>





**Related Publications from the
Center on International Cooperation**

Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2013

Review of Political Missions 2013

Shaky Foundations | An Assessment of the UN's Rule of Law Support Agenda

Camino Kavanagh and Bruce Jones

State Capture and Organized Crime or Capture of Organized Crime by the State

Camino Kavanagh

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

Edited by Jake Sherman, Megan M. Gleason, W.P.S. Sidhu, and Bruce Jones

Building on Brahimi: Peacekeeping in an Era of Strategic Uncertainty

Strategic Trends, Dilemmas, and Developments in Global Peace Operations

Andrew Sinclair

Robust Peacekeeping: The Politics of Force

Implications of Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in United Nations Mandates

Jake Sherman and Benjamin Tortolani

Mandates and Modalities

Jake Sherman and Benjamin Tortolani

U.N. Peace Operations and State-building: A Case Study of Haiti

Dr. Charles T. Call with Gigja Sorensen

More information about these and other recent publications can be found at cic.nyu.edu.

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

New York University
726 Broadway, Suite 543
New York, NY 10003
(212) 998-3680
cic.info@nyu.edu
cic.nyu.edu