THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

GLOBAL COOPERATION UNDER THREAT: ADAPTING THE U.N. FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Washington, D.C.
Monday, June 15, 2015

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

THOMAS PICKERING
Distinguished Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speaker:

SUSANA MALCORRA
Chef de Cabinet
United Nations

Moderator:

BRUCE JONES
Acting Vice President and Director, Foreign Policy
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

AMBASSADOR PICKERING: Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. My name is Tom Pickering and it is my special pleasure to introduce this afternoon's distinguished guest, Susana Malcorra, who is the Chef de Cabinet of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

A moment ago we were chatting about her job and how interesting it is and how tough it is. And I'm sure she brings to those particular challenges her own distinguished and, indeed, deeply experienced career. As many of you will know, she preceded this present job, which she undertook in March 2012, by a four-year stint of Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, an extremely challenging job dealing with between 80- and 120,000 peacekeepers around the world; many missions of the United Nations and many taxing and challenging questions.

She said of her present job to me just a moment ago, it's everything between the bombing of Sana'a on one hand and, 10 minutes later, a fire in the U.N. garage. And I can imagine it is. Hopefully, there are today no fires in the U.N. garage that are being left untended by your presence here.

Prior to her work as the Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, she had also a distinguished career in the World Food Programme, which, as you know, undertakes the burden of providing to those needy all around the world, the donated and surplus foods that can be made available and provided to many, many thousands of recipients. She was the chief operating officer and the deputy director general of that organization.

She brings as well to us today a distinguished background in the private sector, and a very interesting one. She worked for IBM in the early stages of her career in Argentina, and then left that set of jobs and went into Telefonicas Argentinas, the major

telecommunications company of her country, where she rose to very important and responsible positions in directing the work of that particular organization. So she comes to us with experience that is vast, both in the private sector and now in the international organization and United Nations sector.

Today we're here talking about the future of the United Nations and the potential for change. And I'd like, if I can, just to take a few minutes to talk about one or two of the challenges that are out there.

Having spent a little bit of time myself in dealing with the Security Council, I think it remains at the heart of the organization's capacity to deal with today's overwhelming problems of threat to peace and security. And in that regard, we consistently look at the Security Council, sometimes in anguish over its inability to get its act together and sometimes in deep admiration that it has the capacity, thoughtfully, to provide for the legitimacy and, indeed, the processes that can help the international community deal directly with threats to peace and security.

The veto is, of course, something that no representative of any permanent member would wish to talk about in public. I used to do it somewhat as a basis of deciding how strong and firm my own career was in the United States. But the year that I left American government employment in 2000, I made a proposal which I thought then has legs. I don't think it does now, but our friends in France are following that proposal with some interest, so I thought I would just mention it briefly because I think it can help set off a little bit of our discussion and a little bit of the interesting issues.

The veto, in my view, should be used to promote the interests of the organization and protect the permanent members of the Security Council when what they consider the highest order of vital interest is being threatened and not for other purposes. It is, unfortunately, as we now know well, used for other purposes, some of them

ephemeral, some of them highly political, some of them to send signals, but none of them, in my view, worth the notion of stymieing the work of the Security Council.

My view was, and it still is, that in cases like genocide -- and genocide is a particularly important question -- the Security Council ought to adopt a voting convention among the five permanent members, that when they cannot reconcile a draft and three of them oppose it, then it would be a vetoable draft.

If there are less than three opponents, that will help obviously in negotiating, perhaps, a draft with wider scope and bigger. But when there are less than three, then the others would agree that they should abstain. Now, in my view, this was possible back in the early '90s when, in fact, we emerged from the Cold War and we had eras of good feeling and we had the effective operation of the Security Council. It is not now.

I would temper the voting convention by several caveats. One, one that I mentioned a moment ago, that the voting convention would work except when one of the permanent members felt that a truly vital interest was at stake and told the other members why it was going to break the voting convention. And secondly, my view would be it could be much more acceptable on a broader basis if two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly asked the Security Council to operate under the use of this particular voting convention when threats to peace and security are on the agenda of the Security Council.

Well, these are wonderful ideas. They don't solve the problem, obviously, of how do we get more representation of more deserving states on the Security Council, but my sense is that were we to resolve the question of the use of veto in a way that much more tightly restricted its application, we could perhaps open the door in a more positive way to slightly broader representation. And that would in itself be a

help.

So thank you, Madam Chef de Cabinet, for giving me an opportunity to deliver this message to our audience. (Laughter) And thank you, too, for being with us. Thank you for coming to the platform to give us your thoughts and your remarks. We all look forward to those with a great deal of interest and anticipation. Thank you. (Applause)

MS. MALCORRA: Good afternoon, everybody. It's a pleasure to be here today. I want to thank the Brookings Institute for this opportunity, in particularly I want to thank Bruce Jones for giving me the chance to be here with you today. I also want to add my thanks to Ambassador Tom Pickering. His introduction put a high bar for me and makes me wonder how much trouble I may get in.

I would like to start by referring to the fact that 2015 is a very special year for the United Nations. I'm sure you all remember that this is the 70th anniversary of the United Nations, which essentially it is time to take stock, to define what is it that the institution has done so far and to fundamentally think what is it that institution should be doing towards the future. So it is a very relevant year for all of us, I think for the world at a moment when things are not easy in the world. So the combination of us trying to look inwards and see how we have moved so far and external threats and external factors that put pressure on the United Nations are combined before us.

The first thing I would like to say is that when we look at the U.N., and we look at the charter of the U.N. -- and I would invite you to read the charter of the U.N. if you haven't done it -- it's very interesting because the founding member states have written a charter that is as relevant today as it was 70 years ago. And one wonders how is it that they had such a long-term view when they first wrote the charter.

The charter essentially has three pillars that are: the peace and security

pillar, which is the one that most of the time people refer to and I will work into that in a moment, the development pillar, and the human rights pillar. So it's a very interesting combination of elements which are mutually reinforcing because one would say there is no peace without development, as much as one could say there is no development without peace. And more and more, one can say that there is no peace and development without good human rights, and that's exactly where we are.

So our first check is the charter, our founding principles, and those remain as valid as they were, as I said earlier. The interesting thing is that even though the principles stay the same, we do have a question regarding the United Nations and how prepared is the United Nations to address all the challenges that the U.N. and the world has today.

And there is a question which I will try to take us through as I speak of whether the United Nations is the only tool to address all the problems. Sometimes we expect too much from the United Nations and maybe we need to have a consideration of other tools that could address some of the problems.

Let me start talking a little bit about this nature of the challenges that we face today because I think the more we understand the nature of the threats and challenges, the better we can understand what is needed to respond to them and then decide whether there is a right match or not between the U.N. and its ability to deliver, and the needs that these challenges bring.

The first thing I will say is that the United Nations is basically an organization of member states. It's the sum of member states, 193, that essentially recognize their sovereign space as the main basic driver. So we have an organization that is mounted around the notion of sovereignty of member states as a key element to our decision process. Having said that, it is clear that the type of threats we are facing

are essentially cross-border, cross-regional, of global nature. And just let me give you a few examples of those, because I think it's important.

Violent extremism, one of the things that we are speaking on a daily basis, not only in Iraq and Syria, in Libya, in Nigeria, that violent extremism has a way to work that challenges borders, challenges states, challenges all the institutions and the systems that have been established.

Migration. Migration is another clear example of a challenge we have, which is, of course, cross-border, that connects the different regions. And we can see that through the migration that is now on the news, coming out of Libya towards Europe, but we also see it on the Rohingyas coming out of Myanmar. And we see the connection between the political and the security issues, the lack of opportunities, and people moving in a manner that is far beyond anything that one saw in the recent past.

Illegal trafficking is another element that is totally trans-border, trans-regional, that handles itself in a manner that's outside the established systems, but is progressing, and what is even more worrisome is totally interconnected to extremism because it's the way that extremists have to finance themselves. So not only is it an issue on its own, because we see today people trafficking in drugs, arms, people, organs, all of these, it's not only a business on its own, which is horrible enough, but it's also a business that is tied to the extreme groups which need disparate funding for their activities.

Cyber crime is another good example of a threat that we have that is far beyond boundaries. Climate change, a different type of challenge, but as the Secretary-General likes to say, not even the most powerful country in the world can address this challenge on its own. And, again, there is a direct connection between climate change and the development opportunities and peace and security.

Pandemics are another very important trans-border element and just saw it recently with the Ebola pandemic where something that looked like it started in a small village in Guinea ended up threatening this country and Europe because it went beyond anything that one could imagine at the beginning.

So the question here is, how do we find a way to adjust the toolbox of the United Nations in a coherent manner, with the agreement of member states, to tackle the issues that are before us that are so different in their nature from the ones that we used to have that essentially were confrontation between member states? How do we do that in a manner that member states feel that the organization is trustworthy to handle it? And it is done in a manner that, again, respects the notion of sovereign states that is the basis of the United Nations.

The other reality is that these challenges are absolutely of an asymmetric nature. Most of them are such that established institutions, customs, all the established parts of a state are not prepared to handle it. So it's not even the United Nations that is lacking the tools to address, that often it is member states themselves that lack the right tools to address them. So it is a very interesting moment because one can argue that more than ever before, cooperation among member states is required to address these. And cooperation through the United Nations should be the way to go forward.

So, as much as there is a challenge, there is a gap. We don't have the right instruments. It looks like an opportunity because no one can address this on his own. So we have to be innovative and we have to act fast because the enemies we have in front of us are very, very fast on their feet, maximize the use of media, maximize the use of all the openings and all the opportunities that these systems give them to bypass the systems.

So, in this context, what is the United Nations doing? What are we

facing? Trying to do brief scanning of the horizon, I think one can say that probably the United Nations is facing today more fires -- and not exactly in the garage -- than ever before. If you look at our work, starting from Afghanistan, you can see that there is a pattern that allows us to understand the interconnectivity of the issues, but each one of those issues being almost intractable at this point in time.

You know, you go from Afghanistan where al Qaeda has been at its heart, and you start to move from there to Iran, Syria, and Yemen, and you start to see there that now we have not only the conflicts on their own merit, but we have the presence of DAJ, ISIS, ISSL, name it however you want, and there is a new development which is the competition between al Qaeda and these new approaches, and how they view themselves in seizing power and in acquiring the relevance that they want to have.

So we are involved in each one of these countries, trying to find ways to move the different parties into a solution. But then you add to that the influence or the different perspective of the regional players in each one of these places, so there's the overlay of different views, different geopolitical interests coming from the neighboring countries, which adds to the complexity and which has led us, in the case of Syria, to be into an impossible situation already for four years without any hint of a solution yet, as much as a special envoy is trying to work one.

So how do we find a way, connecting all of these dots, to rethink how we can offer solutions to member states, how we can offer solutions to the people who are suffering there? The humanitarian situation in all of these countries is absolutely incredible and delivering humanitarian aid is a good first step, but it's far from enough. Only finding a political solution that gives people an opportunity is what is going to get us there.

Of course, we have the Middle East -- the long lasting issue of the Middle

East -- which is yet very, very difficult to see a solution in the near term. And which one, again, could connect to the rest of the questions, particularly in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen.

Then we get to Africa. And Africa traditionally had its own dynamics. When you go to the Great Lakes region and you have the question of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, you can see there that there is a big pending question of solving the access to all the people. You have the different rebel groups that are trying to seize a space and an opportunity, but it's a conflict of traditional nature.

Then you have Somalia, and Somalia is not a conflict of traditional nature because precisely Al-Shabaab is absolutely linked to these other groups and are now trying to decide whether they will pledge allegiance to al Qaeda or they pledge allegiance to DAJ. Tension there that may bring to Somalia the same approach that we have seen with Boko Haram in Nigeria.

And then you can go, of course, to Libya and see what is happening in Libya. Again, not only the unresolved issue of establishing the institution, but also the question of the opportunity that these extreme violent groups have seized, and now have taken a huge amount of territory with the implications, as I mentioned earlier, of migration and the impact that this has in Europe.

So something that is happening in Africa that starts from far away now has a direct impact on Europe and has created a very strong reaction in people and in the governments of Europe with a great deal of concern. And out of Libya you can go to Mali. And again, Mali has a situation of a mix of smuggling, extreme groups, allegiances to different subgroups, a very shift in reality that has made our peacekeeping mission in Mali be the target to these groups. And we have lost in that mission, which has a little bit over a year, more than 70 peacekeepers already. So that shows to you how much we have become a target on our own.

So all of this to say these issues that we handle one by one are absolutely interconnected. And unless we can establish those connections and tackle those connections at their heart, it's very hard to really see a future where winning solutions will be available -- could be produced by the U.N. or by U.N. partners.

What are we doing then with this reality? And now I'm going to mention something that Ambassador Pickering referred to. All of this is overseen by the Security Council, so it's a combination of us in the Secretariat trying to deliver to the best of our ability -- sometimes very well, sometimes short of being that good -- but when the Security Council comes together behind an issue, and I could make a reference to chemical weapons in Syria, it's clear that we can make it happen.

As much as some people may argue that we are not certain that all chemical weapons have been out of Syria, the reality is that we have reduced the presence of chemical weapons in Syria dramatically. All of this was done because the Security Council was solid behind this objective. It's clear that that's not the case in Syria for the rest of the file, the political file, and it's clear that while there is a bigger confrontation -- and Ukraine represents that bigger confrontation -- among members of the Security Council the chances for all of us to move forward this very difficult agenda that has so many nuances and so many connections is less and less likely to happen and happen well.

So for us, the Security Council coming together and seeing in the same way the issues at hand is absolutely important.

What is happening from our end to try and do the -- stop taking and adapt to the future, a few things that I will just mention to you. The first one is the Secretary-General's Peace Operations Panel. He commissioned that panel at the end of the last year, And the panel is coming now with a report, it should be out in the next few

days, with recommendations on how to strengthen our peace operations. And this means not only peacekeeping, but also the political missions, trying to see how we can find ways to work in a manner that is tighter, that delivers better, both in political terms and in military terms when the Security Council so decides.

And here there is a very interesting analysis to take into account, going back to the charter, which is the eventual use of Chapter 8 of the charter, which is the chapter that associates the U.N. to the regional organizations and says that one can use regional organizations when that seems to be the best option. So in this day and age, with this combination, and going back to my question whether the U.N. should be the one doing everything, Chapter 8 is one of the elements that maybe is worth considering as a tool to be used more frequently moving forward.

The other thing that is happening is a review of the Peace-Building Commission. That's an element that is driven by member states. But the notion of peace-building and trying to see how we reinforce that transition between the conflict and the post-conflict and the elements of association between the security and the development I think is very essential and is being reviewed. And we should have an output, an outcome later in the year.

There is also a review on the 1325, which is women in conflict, which is very important because a lot has been done regarding women in conflict, but I think we are still behind where we should be.

Then there is another element, very interesting element, on the development pillar, which is the Post 2015 Agenda. And there is an incredible amount of work done member states to discuss what comes after the MDGs at the end of 2015. And we have seen so far a very interesting agenda put together, which is all-inclusive. It applies to all states of the world, contrary to what the MDGs were, which was a little bit of

the developed world dictating the developing world. An agenda that is centered on people and planet, so it connects to sustainability around development, and it also is very much centered on inequality, which is an issue that prevails all over the world and that one could argue is one of the elements why so much is happening with extreme ideas taking root among youngsters, particularly youngsters, with our job.

And the last thing to name the third pillar of the charter that we are working on is Human Rights Up Front, which is an initiative of the Secretary-General, that puts human rights at the center of the work of the United Nations, no matter where you work, be that in the development side, be that in the humanitarian, to connect the dots and to be able to look at the early signals coming from member states or from societies where the lack of respect for human rights most likely will lead into a situation of conflict sooner or later.

So all of this to say we are reviewing ourselves. We are assessing ourselves. We are taking stock of what we have done. We are not complacent. We understand that what we have done is good in some occasions, far from getting to the expectations in others. But what's most important, what we need to do is probably something different and requires a different toolbox and different tools than the ones we have. And we need to define what that is, and that's part of where we are working, together with member states, to leave enough space to the United Nations to expand or to the side where the United Nations should not be and how that should be structured in a manner that is still as coherent within the international system.

There's a lot before us. I think adaptability, flexibility, and a long-term thinking is part of what is required. And I can tell you that is very difficult when you are trying to catch up with fires from the garage to whatever in the world, and do it in a manner that nothing falls between the cracks.

So thank you. I hope this helps to teach ideas. And, of course, I'd be more than happy to answer all the questions. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. JONES: Well, thank you very much. I'm Bruce Jones. I'm the acting vice president of the Foreign Policy Program here at Brookings. Let me start by adding my thanks to Susana Malcorra for coming here today. I've known Susana for nearly a decade and I remember from the very first time we met being impressed by your frankness, your honesty, and your dedication, which has continued unabated in what is easily the most complex job in the international system. So our thanks to you for the service that you do for the U.N. and for us.

I'm not going to try to get you into trouble by pushing you to answer Tom's question, per se, but I do want you to talk a little bit more about the dynamics in the Security Council. Over the last 20 years, we've seen an enormous evolution of the U.N. and you've been sitting at the helm of large parts of it, but unity of the Security Council was the essential condition for that, and you talked yourself about how important that is.

And now you have a situation where the Security Council is absolutely deadlocked on some key files, like Syria and Ukraine, and yet amply cooperating on others. And I just wonder if you can describe what it is like to work with the Council in that slightly odd circumstance.

MS. MALCORRA: Well, you get in me trouble with your evil questions. (Laughter) You know, it's really very, very interesting what you said, Bruce, because indeed it's true as much as there is almost an impossible situation in certain files and one discussion gets totally stuck one day, that morning you get stuck, in the afternoon you discuss something different and there is unity and you see how the agenda can move forward. So how we can get the members of the Security Council to have a common

view on the issues that they are not seeing eye-to-eye is our big question mark.

I sincerely don't believe that we can do much about it. We can offer options. We can think ideas that can compromise. I always believe that the Secretariat, the Secretary-General, can bring to the table alternatives that maybe can help ease the tension. But when you have profound differences between two permanent members or more of the Security Council that are at the heart of their own policy, it's very difficult for the Secretary-General to fix that. So while this gap exists, I think we have to assume that the hands of the United Nations are going to be quite tied because the United Nations in questions of peace and security is only an instrument of the Security Council. We don't have a capacity of our own.

So other than volunteering options that at least can give the members of the Security Council alternatives that maybe they had not thought about, and that can be a first step to move the agenda, the rest will still lay in the hands of the member states.

MR. JONES: Do you ever find yourself playing the opposite role? Here's what I'm thinking. You know, of course, the U.N. has by practice and, to a certain extent, by policy taken the view -- I certainly did when I worked in the U.N. -- that the U.N. should be able to talk to anybody, crazy groups, rogue states, et cetera. But do you ever find yourself reaching the conclusion that a particular actor -- I won't ask you to name any names -- that a particular actor is simply intractable, simply impossible to work with? And the message you have to the Security Council is we need to move on from a political solution. Do you ever find yourself in that role, you the Secretariat?

MS. MALCORRA: Well, it's clear that we have often to speak with very, very difficult actors and we have done that throughout time. But it's also clear that as you get into this new era that I described earlier, where people who essentially reject institutions are the ones that are part of the conflict, it's hard for us to have them as

interlocutor.

First, I don't think they care about us being in interlocutor, but from our perspective it's very difficult because essentially we are the institution at its maximum level. And if you are trying to deal with somebody who disrespects, disregards, and wants to destroy institution, how can you establish a negotiation there or a compromise there? It's such a principal issue that I think it's hard to think how to embrace these groups.

MR. JONES: Staying on radical extremism and terrorism issues for a moment, you described a number of the themes that you were reconsidering and you're looking at. But when it comes to the question of violent extremism, these trans-border issues, you talked about migration, smuggling, et cetera, is it also the case that you need to be working with other actors? In other words, the kind of concentration of the U.N. is with its member states. You come from the private sector. There are civic groups, there are social media. Does the U.N. need to shift who it's working with in trying to tackle these problems?

MS. MALCORRA: Well, it's clear that the U.N. needs to open up and it's opening up to a much larger number of stakeholders. That, again, is tricky with the notion of an organization that is a member state organization. So we need to be able to construct circles of outreach where, in the end, the center remains the General Assembly and its 193 members states. But we need to recognize that social media is a reality so we need to outreach to each one of the citizens of the world in a different manner. Some of them don't see themselves represented even by their own governments, so it's clear that we need to be able to transpire the principles in a different way.

But not only that, we need also resources to build the solutions that we need to build, that go far beyond what member states can do on their own. You know,

when you talk about the Post 2015 Development Agenda and you think about the figures that are behind that agenda, it's clear that this is not something that comes out of ODA or member states providing assistance. That's not it. It will require private sector, it will require an engagement of NGOs, of foundations, of all sorts of sources that will help build, construct the solutions.

All of this is very difficult for the United Nations and it's very difficult because dealing with private sector is, for example, a new proposition, and often the United Nations does not understand how to deal with the private sector. It's trying to set the stage for a relationship with the private sector that is mutually satisfactory, that is win-win, requires for the United Nations to realize what value is there for the private sector in the U.N. brand, that's something we don't do well, and to sit with the private sector on sort of an equal footing.

So all of this is something we need to develop because there is a divide between the public and the private. I'm not suggesting we need to blur the divide. I mean, there are different responsibilities, but we need to establish a good communications link.

MR. JONES: Briefly, before we go to the audience, I want to talk to you about peacekeeping. You obviously played a huge role in overseeing U.N. field operations, 120,000 peacekeepers at its maximum. I was struck by a statistic that somebody from your old shop shared with me, that the territory that falls currently under U.N. mandates is slightly than the Holy Roman Empire at its peak. Does the U.N. Secretariat have the staff, the structures, the support that it needs to manage that scale of operations? You can just say no. (Laughter)

MS. MALCORRA: Well, it all depends in comparison with what? If you look at the United States' own forces, military forces, and the relationship of direct/indirect

(inaudible) in the U.S., we are at a place that is nowhere to be compared. If you look at NATO, again, nowhere to be compared. So it's clear that we don't have the same strength of oversight and support that some of these institutions have.

But it's also clear that the construction around the peacekeeping operations that member states envisioned was totally different. The command and control is different. The relationship between the military deployment and their own capitals is always there, which makes things ever more difficult.

So the short answer is, no, I'm sure we don't have everything we need, but it's also true that I don't see an appetite from member states to pour in many more resources. So what we are trying is to do the best we can with the resources we have. And I think when you look at it, all-in-all, the balance is quite positive. Having said that, we have many, many areas to make progress on.

MR. JONES: Let me ask you about one of them. I mean, there have been a number of stories recently on sexual exploitation by peacekeepers. This is an issue that Kofi Annan adopted a kind of zero tolerance policy and Ban has adopted a zero tolerance policy, but it continues to be a challenge. And just say a few words about your thinking and what you're doing on that.

MS. MALCORRA: Well, clearly, since Secretary-General Kofi Annan's time and Zaid's panel, where there were suggestions made to change how the organization handled these issues, a lot of progress has been made. We see now systemic approaches to follow on the issues, to track situations. But it's also true that member states decided that this was, in the end, going to be their responsibilities, it was going to be in their hands. So we get to one point where you transfer the file to member states and it's pretty much in their hands.

So the Secretary-General is looking into this now and member states are

looking into this. Probably there is a need to take a second look to those recommendations and some that may come after 10 years of experience, and try to tighten that relationship with member states. It's a very difficult thing because, again, this goes back to the question of a sovereign state, that lends military to you, but they're always, in the end, under their responsibility and jurisdiction.

So the bottom line is we now have much better sense of what is happening than what we had before. Some of these are very, very appalling things that just cannot stand. They should not happen, but at least it's better that we know they happen. And bringing these to the limelight hurts because it hurts the institution, as we know. But until we get them to zero, there is not a single case, it's better to be hurt than to ignore.

MR. JONES: Let's turn to the audience and I'll take several questions and come back to you. We'll run a little bit over time, so I'm going to do this grouping in the middle here. Right here.

And please identify yourself and please ask a question.

MS. G. NGUYEN: Thank you. My name is Genie Nguyen and I'm with Voice of Vietnamese Americans. Thank you, Madam.

My question has to do with Asia and the current tension that is kind of imminent, but manifest, including everything that you listed with human rights, development, and peace and security. So to that, especially with the tensions in the South China Sea and the diversions with the conflicts in between rising powers and many others and the U.N., my question to you is do you think we have adequate representations of the region in the Security Council, how to build a Security Council capacity base and the original representatives?

And then, also, what institutions do you think are being threatened by the

powers in that conflict? Is there anything that we can do to retain (inaudible), maintain the respect to the institutions? You said it was detrimental if the U.N.-established institutions being rejected or disregarded. Is that what I gather from you?

So please give us your suggestion how to best resolve the current conflicts in Asia. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Thanks. There were a couple right behind.

MS. BINETTI: Thank you. Ashley Binetti, Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace, and Security.

You mentioned the upcoming review of 1325, and I was curious, beyond the global study and the review itself, what the office has been doing to improve the gap between implementation and rhetoric. We have 7 wonderful resolutions and yet only 3 percent of women were -- or only 3 percent of peace negotiations had women as signatories. So I'm wondering what the SG's office can do to improve that. Thank you.

MR. JONES: Back behind.

MS. Y. NGUYEN: Yan Nguyen, Foundation for Empowerment NGO. Thank you very much for your passionate speech of dedication and your commitment to international organizations.

I used to work for the World Bank, over 20 years, and in the meanwhile I was working for WHO in Geneva, the Commission on Macroeconomics and Health. So at that time I could make the comparison between World Bank and the U.N. And a while I was working for both and then, you know, there are so many international -- so many institutions by the U.N.

In terms of peace and development, I cannot agree with you more that your peace and development goal, hand-in-hand. But there are many institutions the U.N. proliferated that missions are overlapping and that they are very much, to be polite,

they are sort of like marginalized. I don't know their effectiveness.

And as a person who used to work on the international development stuff, hard to breaking that when the Eastern Europe community -- I mean, the Wall had collapsed and there's no institutions, no organization. You're an organization, but you are based in Vienna. Had any (inaudible) mission because the client has now been open to capitalism. But because about 170 staff's interest, that institution tends to disappear and it survived and still goes on.

So my question in the end is that is it really nice to hear that the U.N. is trying to stock of the last 70 years and try to move forward in that review and in that commitment. Is the U.N. willing to take a look at some of the institutions and (inaudible) if they are overlapping, like I said, they are willing to and that they have determined to eliminate some of them? And if they don't need -- if they don't' have a capacity can they really work with others rather than just making another institution? Thank you very much.

MR. JONES: I think that gives you enough to chew on for a first round. (Laughter)

MS. MALCORRA: I will start with the last one. And I think it is clear that the U.N. has grown throughout time in an organic manner. There has been no particular design of the architecture of the U.N. In fact, we have had different organizations flourish in different times and based on real needs at the time.

One can also argue that after a certain process some of these organizations could be mainstreamed into others or merged is a very, very difficult exercise because each one of these organizations has member states involved and there is a strong ownership by member states. And member states sometimes are different ministers in member states. They are not a single member state. It's very interesting because often member states ask us to be more coherent, coordinate better among

ourselves, and we see that member states themselves not necessarily coordinate in the system and in the presence in the system. So I think the part of fee-for-purpose that I mentioned as we move forward is exactly trying to see how we tackle that.

You know, one of the biggest problems I see we have these days internally is the need for coordination to get things done. Sometimes coordination becomes an end of its own and you spend so much in coordination that you lose sight of why is it that you are there and who are you there to serve? So we need to find ways to simplify and to define our mandates in a manner that is more clear, has less overlap, and, at the same time, is more geared towards working together.

Having said this, that is all the nice things one likes to hear, there is a very strong competition for resources these days. And that goes against the notion of coming together because it's so difficult to fund the programs we have, it is so much that we rely on extra-budgetary funding that the different agency funds and program fight for the pool of resources as a matter of survival. So there is a big tension and a big contradiction between something that is absolutely significant, which is pool income together, sharing, and, at the same, the notion that unless you have your own institution recognized, it's unlikely that you'll get enough resources.

So for me, that's part of the fit for purpose, how we adapt the United Nations to this reality of the 21st century, particularly to this reality of the Sustainable Development Agenda, which will require a totally different approach by member states and by us. So a long question that has not really a precise answer, but it's work before us, no doubt.

The Secretary-General has been -- I'm starting backwards -- has been very, very keen on the question of women. If you look at the presence of women in the Secretariat, in very, very important positions, it has grown exponentially during Secretary-

General Ban's term. He also believes very deeply that women should be an essential part of negotiation and press processes.

You know, when I work on his behalf in the Great Lakes, we brought to the table the women. And in the framework that was agreed upon, the 11 member states, women had a relevant piece to address and it's working. It's a matter of putting pressure and putting pressure and putting pressure. It doesn't come automatically. People don't think in those terms naturally, so the only way is to resurface the issue. That's why this stop taken is so important, the review is so important, and adding and adding and adding pressure. It doesn't go in automatic mode, for sure.

Then on the question of adequate representation, first, I cannot answer that. This is a question to be answered by member states. I'm sure I can have somebody come in from my region and making exactly the same argument or somebody coming from Africa making that same argument. What is clear is that there is a very wide agreement that something should change regarding representation. There is a wide disagreement on how this should be done. So as long as there is no common view on how to make it happen, it's very, very difficult that something will materialize anytime soon.

MR. JONES: Let me ask you on that, it's one thing to talk about representation, but are you seeing a different level and quality of engagement by the group of countries we tend to describe as emerging powers, by India, by Brazil, by China? Are you seeing a difference in their engagement at the U.N.?

MS. MALCORRA: Well, to me, I don't have that long history in the United Nations, so I don't know how they were when the ambassador was in the United Nations. I cannot compare. But it's clear to me from what I see that these emerging powers feel that they don't have enough share of the say. And this goes beyond the

Security Council only and that often the agenda is not shaped with their participation in a very, very established manner.

And just to give an example, talking about the design of mandates by the Security Council and their participation as stakeholders, TCCs or PCCs, is something they continuously ask to be more open and direct participation. So no doubt that they see themselves in a manner that is not fully reflected in the way we work.

MR. JONES: Let's go back to the audience. So I'll start up here and I'll work my way back.

MR. BERG: Thank you. Bob Berg, I was senior advisor to four different parts of the U.N.

In a few weeks, a report on global governance will come out that Madeleine Albright and Ibrahim Gambari have co-authored, and I think you probably have been briefed on it. One thing they've talked about in the report is that we ought to take an optic to the 75th anniversary and really work on building support for major changes. And I'm wondering if there was an agenda that you had of perhaps different financial formulas, perhaps ideas for reforming the general assembly that you think should be worked on.

And I have to just as a coda say that another great gift from Argentina to the Vatican is going to come out. He's going to come out with a very major statement and I'm wondering how the United Nations is going to capitalize on that. (Laughter)

MR. JONES: We sometimes refer to the sec-gen as a secular pope, so we'll put that in an Argentinean context. (Laughter)

The gentleman in the back.

MR. MINTZER: Madam Malcorra, my name is Irving Mintzer. I'm a professor at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies next

door.

One of the challenges that you mentioned, that of climate change, is an area in which the leadership and vision of the Secretary-General has led to powerful and I would say transformational change. His leadership, which was illustrated last year dramatically at the U.N. Climate Summit, actually did broaden the circles of outreach and engagement and has led to opening the dialogue on development-oriented solutions to climate change beyond sovereign states and engaging the private sector, especially the financial services sector, in an extraordinarily successful way.

By raising the ambition of leading corporations, the EOSG has brought new hope into what had begun to become a somewhat stultified process of negotiations among member states. Could you please say a little bit about how you see the role of the EOSG and the climate change support team continuing in this broadening effort to create the opportunity for engagement of the private sector equals with the U.N., going beyond COP21 in December of this year and on toward a fuller solution, a cooperative, a collaborative solution to the climate challenge that builds the framework for sustainable development.

MR. JONES: I'll take one more before we go back to Susana. Right in the back, the lady in the back.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I work for FAO Lau here in Washington, D.C. I just have one quick question.

In addressing all the different and complex problems in the world, what are the things that are unique that U.N. can provide and no other entities are able to offer in this drastically changing environment? Thank you.

MR. JONES: Susana.

MS. MALCORRA: Thank you. On the report on global governance, I

know a bit. I'm not really yet fully privy to what is coming out, so I will navigate the basic I know, so forgive me if I'm not totally exposed to it.

I think the notion of having a five-year perspective to what is needed to change is a very interesting notion. One of the problems, you know, is coming from the private sector I always thought that the private sector was very short-term oriented and didn't have enough of a strategic horizon. I have learned now that there is a much bigger strategic horizon in the private sector than the one we have, again, fire after fire and being pulled and pushed by the realty of today and reacting to the reality of today. So being able to have an agenda that is developed over a period of time and that has the common understanding by member states to me is fundamental. That means that member states need to trust that that agenda is in the interest of everybody and work towards that agenda.

Reform is often seen with a suspicious mind within the United Nations. There is a certain relationship between reform and cost-cutting measures. And I think it's wrong to see it from that perspective. I believe that many member states, many of the emerging powers that we referred to understand that there is a need for a broad reform that goes beyond the Security Council. So if we were able to articulate a few things with a common agreement by member states, I think that is a very powerful way to move the United Nations.

What will I suggest to put in there? Well, it is clear that there is a strong tension between the General Assembly and its willingness to delegate powers to the Secretary-General. It's not different from any other legislative body in the world with the executive body. I'm sure in this town this is a very well-known reality.

The question of how deep you go into managing what is under the responsibility of the Secretary-General as chief administrative officer, I think it's

something that requires a conversation. It can only happen if member states fully trust that the Secretary-General is going to do this in the best interest of the organization and not managed by any external factor.

So that will be something that, for me, is important to see whether there is an opportunity to come to a common view and move that agenda forward. It will make a big difference probably in how fast and how creatively the U.N. can react.

Having said that, there is a very interesting example that happened with Ebola. The GA reacted to the Secretary-General's proposal in three days. So when there is a will, there is a way. And it's a good example of the General Assembly working towards something that was absolutely in demand, that needed to happen now, and we got resources within a week. So sometimes we think that this cannot work, but maybe there is an interest to make it work. It can be proven that it is possible.

The Secretary-General and climate change, I think this is an excellent example of how much a Secretary-General can do in a certain agenda. We were having a conversation with Ambassador Pickering and Bruce before coming in, and we were talking about how much influence the Secretary-General has. And this question of is the Secretary-General a secretary or a general, and all these things.

I think that the Secretary-General has much less influence than what people perceive the Secretary-General has. But, at the same time, he has much more influence than some others believe he or she has. I will add the "she" now to be politically correct.

It's Secretary-General Ban and his own conviction that move this agenda. And, you know, when everybody went to Copenhagen and that did not materialize, it would have been easy for him to give up. It was a very difficult moment and he did not give up. So he has worked with every single member state on this

agenda, the very big powers, the very small nations that are now drowning themselves in water, and he has made the case, I think. I wouldn't say that Secretary-General Ban is the only one, but his high moral ground has really helped in shaping this agenda.

Now we have the Pope adding his voice, so I hope that that will also bring more to the table. It's clear that, again, as I discuss about development, this is an agenda that will not happen just with the engagement of member states. The biggest contributors in a positive or in a negative way will be in the private sector. So unless we enlarge in a very concrete manner, the commitment of the private sector, unless we make sure that there is alignment between what private sector does, what policies are established by governments, and what overview of all of these is don't at an international level, this will not materialize.

It's clear that we will have to think through what comes after December, but we are not there yet. This is something that is being worked, so I don't have a specific answer to your question what is going to happen within our own office, but there will be follow-up to it, no question. This Secretary-General will not let go, I assure you that.

And what is the difference between the U.N., what does the U.N. add as a uniqueness? I think it's clear that the authority and the convening power that the U.N. has through the General Assembly, through the Secretary-General, is something that is totally unique. And, you know, I go very often to meetings of different regional organizations, of different combinations of member states. These meetings are very good, very useful. We need to work with them. They have a very important perspective from a more narrow geographical representation.

But, in the end, there are certain issues that can only be sorted out at the level of a United Nations. That's why we need to treasure the value of the United Nations

as a convener and we need to find a way to make this institution more effective so that we don't lose the trust of the people and we are able to build on it.

MR. JONES: Speaking about the trust of the people, Brookings doesn't do that many events that are standing room only. This one is and there are a lot of people watching on the web, as well. And I look out and I see that the average age is pretty young, especially the young people who very courteously stood at the back. What do you say to young people about engaging at the U.N. and working at the U.N.? Is that something you encourage?

MS. MALCORRA: Well, left me start from a personal perspective. If you would have told me 12 years ago you're going to be in the United Nations, eventually you're going to be the Chef de Cabinet of the Secretary-General, I probably would have answered by saying this is totally crazy out of your mind.

Then for different reasons, I came into the United Nations and I came through one of the strong programs of the United Nations, the World Food Programme. And I came to learn the value of an organization, of a group of organizations, of a system that has a unique presence all over the world and is able to listen to the people of all over the world. I think sometimes, often maybe, we don't listen well enough, so my call to the young people is to involve themselves, to use all means and, of course, social media is available now for people to convey messages, to participate.

Last year we had different meetings in the U.N. that brought NGOs, civil society of different combinations, some youth meetings, and we had 3,000, 4,000 people one single day around a subject. Of course, this is a drop in the bucket of the representation of the world, but there are opportunities. In the case of the Sustainable Development Goals, there was a huge consultation throughout the world. Every single country had a participation of many, many people to try and shape what were the

priorities.

So you need to push us. You need to really claim for your space and to make sure that what we do really serves the purpose. We can only do that if we hear from you. That's a reality.

MR. JONES: Youth is one reality. I was listening, and in your talk you touched on Asia, Latin America, Middle East, Africa, and Europe. One country that didn't come up is the United States.

MS. MALCORRA: I knew better. (Laughter)

MR. JONES: But what is it that you say to American decision-makers about why it is that the U.N. matters to them, matters to us?

MS. MALCORRA: Well, first of all, it is clear to everybody that the United States is the first power in the world, is the most powerful country in the world. So one could assume that being in that position it does not need of anything to support its policies, its decision. To me, precisely being in that unique situation of being the most powerful country, having the United Nations is an ideal setting to engage with others in a manner that is, if I can use the word, not threatening to others. It's a way to set up -- sit around a table and start conversations that probably are not possible in any other way. That's one thing. That's a question of engagement beyond the bilateral because, again, many of the issues that are of concern to the United States citizens are those issues that are cited as cross-border, cross-cutting, and cannot be solved only by the United States.

Then there's the peace and security side of the discussion. And there the United States clearly has a privileged situation in its seat on the Security Council and the veto power in the Security Council. When the people of the United States say, yes, we need to be engaged, but be careful how far and how much, it's clear that the United Nations is a key potential tool that can serve the view and the perspective of the United

States as long as that is agreed with others.

So, yes, it's true that when you get to that, you are not the only one. And that sometimes may be perceived as a downside by the Americans. I think it's precisely the opposite. If you are well involved, well engaged, the chances you have to make your case, to have your foreign policy well represented through the United Nations is very high. So it's a win for me. I don't see it any other way.

MR. JONES: Brookings is about to turn 100 and we go through our strategic planning process to think about what that means, but I suspect your job is harder as the U.N. turns 70 and you adapt the organization and its extraordinary complexity to the world around you. The U.N. is often in the news for firefighting and for failures, but I have to say it's an enormous privilege to see up front and up close the talent and the dedication of the people who actually make it work and make sure a contribution. So thank you for being here today to share that with us.

MS. MALCORRA: Thank you, Bruce. Thank you. Thank you.

(Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016