

1. Overview: In what ways have your past experiences, positions, and duties promoted or demonstrated a commitment to the principles of the United Nations?

I have been privileged, in my 28 years of service to the United Nations, to work in a wide variety of areas integral to its principles – protecting and assisting refugees, notably at the peak of the Vietnamese “boat people” crisis, and conducting humanitarian operations; coping with the many challenges of peacekeeping at the end of the Cold War; serving in the Secretary-General’s office during Kofi Annan’s transformative first term; and now managing and leading a large department that I was appointed to reform, while conceiving and articulating a vision of the Organization’s role in the world. In the process I have seen, from the inside and the ground up, most of the major types of challenges with which a Secretary-General can expect to be faced. I believe I can handle them well. I offer both continuity and change: continuity with the best traditions of the United Nations, change because change is a constant in our Organization. I believe an effective United Nations is the indispensable global institution for our globalizing world. And a vital task of the next Secretary-General will be to ensure that the institution is ready for the challenges of the 21st century, building on the changes Kofi Annan has already introduced but prepared to deal with the unpredictable challenges of tomorrow. Mahatma Gandhi once said, “you must be the change you wish to see in the world”. What is true for individuals applies also to institutions. The UN is no exception. If we want to change the world, we must change too. And I suggest, in all humility, that managing change is best done by someone who knows how to do it – who has demonstrated a profound commitment to the Organization, who values and respects the principles of the institution he serves, and whose record has translated that respect into an active and sustained commitment to results.

2. Peace and Security: In the past two decades, the UN’s peacekeeping operations have grown to become one of its largest and most prominent functions. What aspects of the current debate on peacekeeping, as reflected, *inter alia*, in the Brahimi Report on Peacekeeping Operations, are especially important for creating more accountable and effective forces in addressing the most severe challenges to peacekeeping and peacebuilding?

Clearly the maintenance of international peace and security is a primary function of the United Nations, and when you speak of the “current debate”, it is fair to say that the Organization’s many successes in this area often seem to be overlooked. Over the years, more than 170 UN-assisted peace settlements have ended regional conflicts. And in the past 15 years, more civil wars have ended through mediation than in the previous two centuries combined, in large part because the UN provided leadership, opportunities for negotiation, strategic coordination and the resources to implement peace agreements. Yet, of course, the UN has also acted unwisely at times, and failed to act at others, resulting in failures and setbacks that are common knowledge.

That said, there are many areas in which UN peacekeeping and peacemaking operations must be improved. A great deal has been done in recent years to make peacekeepers more accountable, from the establishment of a “zero-tolerance” policy for sexual harassment on UN missions, to the establishment of mechanisms to report and address misbehaviour. Vitaly important in this process has been the Zeid Report, which -- among other things -- applied real pressure on Member States to ensure that those found guilty of crimes or breaches of discipline while on UN service are prosecuted by their governments (do not forget that the UN itself has no jurisdiction over its soldiers on matters of pay or discipline).

But more needs to be done, beginning with the completion and proper implementation -- by both the Secretariat and UN Member States -- of the standard operating procedures that are in train. A

body of peacekeeping best practice is being developed, and this development must be enhanced and enforced.

On the political level, it is important to reinforce the trend of the last five years, of the Secretary-General insisting that the UN's legislative bodies take seriously the resource and mandate requirements that UN's experts determine are needed. In a nutshell, this is based on the Brahimi report's maxim of telling the Security Council what it needs to know, not what it wants to hear. And while a good Secretary-General must sometimes oblige the Member States to accept politically unpalatable truths about what is needed to protect civilians or disarm combatants, he must also find ways to build their trust in the Secretariat's ability to manage complex and difficult tasks. Governments must know that when they entrust their taxpayers' money or their citizens' lives to the UN, the net result will be a much improved chance of peace.

All the peacekeeping successes of the UN depend on three things: a realistic mandate that is doable and worth doing; resources (financial, human and military) that are commensurate with the mandate; and a third element on which both mandate and resources are dependent -- political will. Without political will you will not get a strong and feasible mandate and you will not get the resources to fulfill it, so you end up either putting a superficial bandage on a deep wound, as happened to us in Bosnia, or not going in at all, as happened in Rwanda, or pulling out too soon, as happened in Somalia. So the fundamental challenge is to ensure that we conceive of our operations realistically, not give in to the minimalism of "what the political traffic will bear", and insist that the Council back us fully when they send us in.

There are many problems that have not been solved since the Brahimi Report was written. We need to mount effective peace-keeping operations more rapidly: currently they take too long to deploy and are uneven in quality. We need to bring the Western countries back into peacekeeping in a bigger way -- currently the armies of the developed world are largely not serving under the blue flag. I do believe that we are the most successful practitioner, and will likely remain the means of choice, to monitor peace treaties. And when territories must be administered while political solutions evolve and the modus operandi for lasting peace are established, the world will continue to turn to the UN since it transcends any one Government's interests but acts in the name of all. But where others have the capacity, the resources and the will to keep the peace -- NATO in Afghanistan, the EU in Bosnia, though not yet the AU in Darfur -- the UN should stand aside and bless their efforts. And where the task -- enforcing peace in Iraq, for instance -- is clearly beyond us, we should confine ourselves to political, electoral, and constitutional assistance (as well as humanitarian and development work where feasible) and let wars be fought by warriors, not peacekeepers.

But, as recent history makes clear, it would be foolish to imagine that a well-supported end to hostilities will somehow organically lead to a stable nation. One important development arising from last year's World Summit was the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission. This body aims to address the problem that many conflicts resume within five years after the peacekeepers have left -- as proven tragically yet again by East Timor -- so we need an institution that includes the development bodies, the World Bank, as well as the Security Council and the troop contributors, to ensure a continuum from conflict through peacekeeping to development and democratic institution-building. When it is fully operational, the Commission should provide the legislative support and oversight needed to enable UN peacekeeping to merge seamlessly with the kind of institution-building and capacity-building that is traditionally the work of bilateral donors, UN agencies and NGOs, and is essential to the rebuilding of societies that have been decimated by war. The Peacebuilding Commission is not yet fully operational, and a priority task of the

UN's next Secretary-General must be to work closely with Member States to ensure that peacebuilding becomes an integral part of the UN's peace and security responsibilities. If the new Commission does its work well, it could be a major tool to ensure that both peace and development are sustainable in formerly conflict-ridden countries.

3. Protecting Civilians: The UN Charter opens with, “We the peoples of the United Nations,” yet the organization remains a primarily intergovernmental body. The UN Secretary-General therefore is responsible to both the citizens of the world and the Member States. Where is the threshold between the UN’s (and the Secretary-General’s) obligations to protect civilian populations and to respect national sovereignty?

You’re right -- the UN Charter opens with, “We the peoples of the United Nations,” yet we act as if it’s “we, the governments”. But in fact we can’t protect people without governments. The Secretary-General has an exhortatory role, but no armies of his own; to be able to protect civilians, he needs the political will of Member States in the Security Council to intervene where civilian populations are being abused. In his historic speech on intervention made before the General Assembly in 1999, Kofi Annan boldly raised the question of the morality of intervention and the call of conscience, and challenged member states to resolve the tensions between state sovereignty and their responsibility to protect ordinary people. This led to the adoption by the World Summit last year of a new global norm – the “responsibility to protect”. In doing so, world leaders acknowledged that sovereignty confers not only privileges but also responsibilities. And foremost amongst them is the responsibility to protect the well-being of your own citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. If you fail to do that, then the world has the responsibility to protect your victims. But it is not easy to define the threshold your question seeks, not least because it must in the end be Governments who define that threshold in practice – and they are likely to do so only on a case-by-case basis.

Let us not forget that the sovereignty of States must be properly understood and respected -- they are, after all, the "owners" of the Organization and their support and commitment is essential if the UN is to achieve its objectives. States must take pride in, and ownership of, the work they undertake collectively, through the Secretariat, for the betterment of humankind. And the UN Secretariat's new chief must ensure that the UN continues to be a forum where the rich and powerful can commit their strength and their wealth to the cause of a better world and a stage where great and proud nations, big and small, rich and poor, can meet as equals to iron out their differences and find common cause in their shared humanity.

But the Secretary-General must also ensure the UN provides the means to address the gaps and the cracks in the façade of state sovereignty, through which many of the twenty-first century’s problems – from environmental degradation to global epidemics to human rights abuses to international terrorism – would otherwise prosper.

And finally, and at the same time, the Secretary-General must fight to retain the 21st century’s equivalent of the spirit that informed the UN's founding. He must amplify the voices of those who would otherwise not be heard, and never lose sight of the problems facing the vast majority of humanity. He must remain true to the “we, the peoples,” in whose name the UN Charter was signed. No Secretary-General can afford to forget for a moment that the UN is both a result and a source of hopes for a better world – hopes that all human beings share. That is the context within which the question you raise must be pursued.

4. **Human Rights:** The current Secretary-General has written, “[The framers of the UN Charter] decided to create an organization to ensure respect for fundamental human rights, establish conditions under which justice and the rule of law could be maintained, and ‘promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.’” During the past ten years, the Secretary-General has initiated and supported substantial reform of the UN’s human rights machinery in order that human rights could be given its rightful institutional emphasis as one of the three pillars of the United Nations. If you were selected as the next Secretary-General, what specific steps would you take to follow through on these processes?

Although it is not perfect, one of the premier achievements of the UN's first sixty years has been the establishment of a comprehensive and truly admirable international human rights treaty regime. The time has come to turn our collective attention from drafting norms and standards to finding ways to implement them effectively. It is time to move from creation to consolidation.

Having been involved in Kofi Annan’s efforts to make human rights issues a centerpiece of his tenure, I can readily appreciate how fragile the institutional accomplishments of the reform process are and how much careful attention and support they still need to take firm root. For this reason, I think it essential for the new Secretary-General to focus on how to make the human rights reforms of recent years survive and thrive. A great deal has been achieved on several levels: the High Commissioner’s Office is in infinitely better shape than it was in 1997, with significant additional resources having been committed to it; we have the new Human Rights Council; and there has been the overall dramatic change of the place human rights occupy in various areas of the UN’s daily work (even in the Security Council). But institutional consolidation is needed or the mainstreaming can be reversed, the Human Rights Council may fail and the High Commissioner may become marginalized within the Organization. I promise, therefore, to pay sustained attention to these matters, in order to ensure that the hard-fought gains of recent years in the human rights arena are not lost.

Despite the fact that it has some experience of running international tribunals to examine gross violations of human rights, the UN is not, and nor should it be, an international policeman, charged with enforcing international law. Rather, the day-to-day respect for universal human rights that we would all want to be the hallmark of the twenty-first century will only come about when States and their citizens act in concert to insist that these rights are respected.

There are times when a Secretary-General must use the bully pulpit to insist that human rights are respected, and if I am elected I will not shy away from these confrontations. But equally important will be the creation of a full partnership between the UN Secretariat, States and civil society aimed at identifying and addressing actions that undermine or threaten the dignity and respect that is the birthright of every human being. Over the years, at the UN and in my own personal writings and statements, I have not hesitated to state my strongly-held conviction that human rights are of fundamental importance to people in the developing countries of the South. All too often, objections to the applicability of human rights standards are voiced by authoritarian rulers and power elites to rationalize violations that sustain them in power. The authentic voices of the South know how to cry out in pain; those voices must be heeded. It is also essential to broaden our perspectives of human rights and to recognize that the perpetuation of poverty is itself a violation of those rights: as has been well said, human rights begin with breakfast. As Secretary-General, I would seek to use my influence to promote greater awareness of the human rights of vulnerable populations such as internally displaced persons, migrants and members of religious and cultural minorities.

The next Secretary-General must work tirelessly to ensure that the UN's legislative processes focused on human rights are not over-politicized, and that human rights NGOs and experts have all the access they need to those processes. As these processes gain credibility, the issue of human rights will increasingly receive global respect and be accorded its rightful place as the third pillar of the UN edifice. This will depend greatly on the behaviour of the UN's membership, but the capacity of a committed and focused Secretary-General to influence that behaviour should not be underestimated.

We at the United Nations must continue to integrate human rights into every area of our core activities relating to peace, security, and development, and to work with non-State actors, whose vigilance will be essential to that purpose. The recent doubling of the High Commissioner's budget should mean that we can make a difference in operational terms in the field, and not just in the conference rooms in Geneva. The extra resources allocated to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights must be used to increase the Secretariat's capacity to identify human wrongs, to provide the technical advice and support necessary to set in place national mechanisms to address them, and to negotiate these mechanisms into existence. I will strongly support the independence of the High Commissioner and help strengthen her with the resources she needs to do her work to the world's satisfaction.

5. Development: What are the main elements of an effective development strategy, and in which areas should ECOSOC, as opposed to international financial institutions, play a leading role? What specific role should the Secretary-General play in promoting the development agenda?

The one thing we've learned from decades of trying to promote development is that there is no magic formula and each country has to define its development strategy in its own national context. Naturally, in defining its strategy, each country will need to situate itself in the international and regional contexts and work out ways of coping with external forces, often beyond its control. The most often cited success stories of recent times – China, India and Vietnam – point to the success of nationally-owned and designed strategies which sequence policy in an appropriate and calibrated way.

But that doesn't mean the UN is, or can be, a spectator. Development remains a crucial objective for the organization, going back to the Charter's determination that the UN should promote 'better standards of life in larger freedom'. Understanding and coping with the complexities of globalization as well as promoting sustainable development are among the key challenges for the United Nations, especially in ECOSOC, which must work to ensure that the world develops mechanisms that should make successful and sustainable development more likely. Not all that is needed will happen at the UN – the WTO and the Bretton Woods institutions, in particular, have a key role to play – but the UN remains indispensable as the place where political agreement can be reached on development goals, and where the agenda is set on issues that affect the well-being of the overwhelming majority of the world's people, and where the voice of each Member State is heard on that agenda.

The United Nations provides a platform where different concerns – economic, social, environmental and political – can be considered holistically. It provides a forum where governments, practitioners, non-state actors including civil society and the private sector can help in understanding and promoting development objectives. Over the years, particularly in the 1990's, through its various Summits and conferences, the United Nations has established frameworks and set targets and timetables for measurable development goals, none more important than the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The United Nations and ECOSOC,

in particular, need to keep this development agenda under constant review and provide the political impetus to realize the MDGs. Development approaches, as defined through the UN processes, stress the need to promote full employment and decent work, protection of the environment, protection for the vulnerable and marginalized, promotion of gender equality as well as respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The UN has also been sensitive to the impact of public health concerns, conflict, and other political and social issues on development. It is only in the United Nations that such a multi-dimensional view is possible. The elaboration of a much broader perspective than is possible within the other specialized agencies underscores the added value of the UN and ECOSOC.

The next Secretary-General will have a crucial role in promoting this development agenda, by being its strongest and most prominent advocate. He has to use his 'bully pulpit' to encourage Member States, both from the North and the South, to fulfill their commitments to development. The SG needs to encourage greater engagement, facilitate the process of reaching consensus at times of apparent deadlock, remind member states of their commitments, encourage greater participation of the stakeholders and get the entire UN System to weigh in with the best expertise available to tackle the complex issues which confront us in the development arena. I will never allow Member States to forget that the UN would not be itself if it did not seek to serve the mass of suffering humanity – to wipe the tear from the eye of the hungriest little girl in the poorest country.

6. Governance: Given the current criticism of the UN for a lack of transparency, accountability and democracy, what are the key opportunities in the UN system for increased democratic governance, allowing all actors – Member States, international organizations, and NGOs – fair representation while ensuring effective decision-making?

ST: The United Nations was created by leaders who were determined to make the second half of the twentieth century different from the much-troubled first – forty-five years in which the world had suffered two world wars, countless civil wars, brutal dictatorships, mass expulsions of populations, and the horrors of the Holocaust and Hiroshima. They drew up rules to govern international behaviour, and founded institutions in which different nations could cooperate for the common good. Their idea -- now called "global governance" – was to create an international architecture that could foster international cooperation, elaborate consensual global norms and establish predictable, universally applicable rules, to the benefit of all – as an alternative to the military alliances and balance of power politics that had wreaked such havoc in the preceding five decades. The new United Nations was created to stand for a world in which people of different nations and cultures would look on each other, not as subjects of fear and suspicion, but as potential partners, able to exchange goods and ideas to their mutual benefit. The UN was to be a place where small states and big would be able to work as sovereign equals, pursuing common objectives in a universal forum. And it would provide a means to address what we sometimes like to call 'problems without passports' – problems that cross all frontiers uninvited (climate change, drug trafficking, terrorism, epidemics, refugee movements and so on) – and whose solutions also can have no passports because no one country or group of countries, however rich or powerful, can tackle them alone.

It is the resolution of these problems that remains at the very core of the UN's activities. And so, in 2006, I would argue that the need for a universal means of global governance, a mechanism for international cooperation -- indeed, let us call it by its name, for a United Nations -- is stronger than ever.

Many players will have an important role to play if that need is to be fully, or at least substantially, met. Governments, certainly, are key to that success. But equally important will be the role of civil society. In no small way, it is the guardian of the reform of the international system. It must use its voice and its expertise to help shape the collective achievements of the United Nations and, of course, to call for change where change is needed. It must do so despite the opacity of some of the UN's systems, and despite the limitations placed by the inter-governmental machinery on the representation of NGOs. The UN – especially its Security Council -- still is better at advocating democratic governance than at embodying it.

So it is civil society that will have to watch over world leaders in the coming months and years to ensure that the decisions the United Nations takes contain no empty promises. This is a grave responsibility, but it is one that I believe civil society is uniquely suited to taking up, on all our behalves, in our universal affirmation of democratic, participatory action. For myself, if elected, I pledge the Organization to greater transparency, higher ethical standards and public accountability; but it is up to the public – the media and civil society – to keep alive our integrity in what we do and how we do it.

7. Gender: How can the UN better promote gender equality and women's human rights, both at the Secretariat and at the operational level? What specifically would you do to strengthen both the gender mainstreaming efforts at the UN as well as the gender "architecture," i.e. the agencies charged with advancing gender equality and women's human rights? How do you envision reaching the UN goal of 50/50 gender balance in the Secretariat?

I'm proud to stand on my record as a Head of Department – a Department with 57% women in professional positions (including a majority at the D-1 level and above) -- in affirming that the gender issue is one where I have "walked the talk". There is a lot more that I can learn about gender mainstreaming efforts at the operational level, and about the work of each of the separate components of the "gender architecture" you mention, but on the basic question, I know where I stand and my commitment to serious and senior female representation in the UN is a matter of record. I'm proud of the fact that the advancement of women has long been a priority for the UN and that the defence and promotion of women's rights is inextricable from the Organization's *raison detre*.

On the architecture, I am awaiting the recommendations of the High-level panel on system-wide coherence, and without in any way disparaging the efforts that each unit has made so far, I will give strong and sympathetic consideration to any recommendation they might make to create a new UN women's agency in the UN, which would take these efforts a qualitative step beyond present levels.

On the second part of your question, you might recall that Article 8 (Chapter 3) of the Charter of the United Nations provides that the United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs. Complete compliance with this Article within the Secretariat, and the full participation of women in all aspects of the work of the Organization, are imperative, not only for reasons of equity, but also to enhance Secretariat effectiveness and the credibility and the leadership role of the United Nations in advancing the status of women worldwide.

As Secretary-General, I would take specific steps toward reaching the goal of 50/50 balance in the Secretariat, including in senior and policy-making posts, as mandated by the General

Assembly, through the introduction of special measures and intensified efforts towards this objective -- including by asking managers and Governments for nominations of qualified women candidates for all posts. In accordance with the Security Council's landmark resolution 1325 on women and peace and security, I will also give priority to developing the right tools to facilitate gender mainstreaming in our peacemaking and peacekeeping work. That also means a zero-tolerance policy towards sexual abuses of any kind, whether in the workplace or in the conduct of peacekeeping operations. I am also aware that the UN does not have enough female SRSGs and Special Envoys. I believe the record of those women who have led our operations in the field is more than good enough to warrant an increase in the number of such appointments of women leaders.

As a UN manager, I am aware that several factors have contributed to the slow progress in improving the status of women in the Secretariat, including recruitment and selection processes, accountability of programme managers, and the working climate and culture in the Organization. If I were elected Secretary-General, I would make it a priority to elaborate creative new strategies for achieving gender parity, building on the efforts of the past few years. Some of these initiatives would include more intensive identification of suitable candidates through targeted outreach to Member States, particularly developing, underrepresented and unrepresented countries; broadening of career development opportunities for women, including temporary assignments to higher-level posts and enhanced skills training; gender training of both men and women at all levels at Headquarters and in the field to promote gender sensitivity in the workplace; making heads of department and office accountable for achieving 50/50 gender distribution; facilitating work/life policies and creating greater opportunities for job rotation and mobility for women.

I would also give emphasis to appointing qualified women to senior positions at Headquarters and in the field, and in my immediate office, as I would wish to set an example for programme managers to follow. To begin with, I pledge to make every effort to identify a suitable female Deputy Secretary-General, one whose experience and credentials will bring stature to the position along with the advantages of her gender.

8. International Justice: How will you support and strengthen the UN's and Member States' commitment to international justice mechanisms such as international criminal tribunals, including the International Criminal Court (ICC)?

In keeping with the World Summit's adoption last year of the responsibility to protect populations from crimes against humanity, I would seek to be a strong advocate of this emerging international norm. Sovereignty confers not only privileges but also responsibilities. And foremost amongst them is the responsibility to protect the well-being of your own citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. If you fail to do that, then the world has the responsibility to protect your victims – and to ensure that you do not enjoy impunity for your crimes. This is where the mechanism of international criminal tribunals – flawed, uneven and mixed though our experience of them has been – is essential. That said, it must be recognized that the ICC, while a vital and laudable milestone on the road to a truly universal system of international justice, is not a UN institution and its success depends on the Member States who are its contracting parties. It is striking to note that institutions and regimes like the ICC, OPCW, and the Landmines Convention have emerged outside the UN but are supportive of its larger purposes and principles, and that they have done so essentially through the creativity and imagination of civil society. As the Security Council's Darfur resolution showed, it is also noteworthy that countries which are not prepared to accept the ICC as a UN body do recognize its

relevance in supporting UN objectives in specific instances. As Secretary-General, I would do everything in my power and within my means to promote mechanisms of international justice, but I would be obliged to respect the positions of the UN's legislative bodies and of the Member States of the Organization in judging how far the institutions of the Secretariat can be used to support these bodies.

9. Environment: How can the UN provide more comprehensive and coherent management and monitoring of the multilateral environmental agreements? How can the UN strengthen a sustainable development-oriented agenda throughout both the Secretariat and at the country level?

The World Summit Outcome is one of the more recent reiterations, at the highest levels, of the need to galvanize action to promote sustainable development. The subsequent steps that have been taken both by the Member States and the SG, in particular through the establishment of a High-Level Panel on system coherence, have included a process for simplifying the current system of managing and monitoring the multilateral environmental agreements. This is a complex issue, since each of these agreements is a legally binding instrument with different contracting parties. However, it is clear that all the Multilateral Environmental Agreements, especially the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol, have demonstrable links with each other. A good model for coherence will have to take into account both the differences as well as the synergies of these agreements. It is apparent that unified Secretariat support would go a long way in building on the strengths of the Conventions, especially in the area of providing strong scientific and analytical capacity.

Your second question, on promoting a sustainable development-oriented agenda at the country level and within the secretariat, deserves better than a glib answer, and yet it is difficult to be specific. I believe that the tools at our disposal -- advocacy, policy support, operational activities in the field and coordination of UN system activities -- have to be used more effectively to mainstream sustainable development in every country. Sometimes, the weight of the multiple challenges before the UN looks daunting and it appears that the political crisis of the day overwhelms everything else -- the urgent too often trumps the important. It is essential to acknowledge how central to sustainable, and indeed sustained, development a robust environmental framework is. To my mind, its design and maintenance must involve key actors which, apart from Member States, include the corporate sector (the United Nations Global Compact is a constructive innovation here with which I would persist), the scientific and academic community (let us not forget that the last Nobel Prize for Chemistry recognized achievements in decreasing pollution) and even the UN's own field workers (who have lived with, and not always lived in harmony with, the environment). As to the Secretariat, my own staff knows me as an ardent conservationist, encouraging the recycling of paper and even the re-use of the blank portions of routing-slips and messages! If elected Secretary-General I would want to take this attitude further across the system, promoting "green buildings" at UN offices and applying environmental concerns to such matters as the purchase of UN vehicles, double-sided photocopying and the wastage of air-conditioning and electricity on holidays and weekends. These seemingly trivial initiatives would collectively make a difference; even more important, they would set an example across the UN system and to Member States. The environment is a long-standing concern of the UN and we need to be unflinching in the fight to protect the environment without compromising on the needs of our generation and those of our children.

10. Disarmament and non-proliferation: What institutional changes are needed within the United Nations, in particular with respect to the role of the Secretariat, to improve the

capacity to respond to global challenges posed by nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, missiles and other means of their delivery, and the risk of their acquisition by terrorists?

First of all, let me be clear that I'm not an expert on every issue, and these are areas when we can and should defer to the experience, expertise and wisdom of the specialized bodies established for this purpose, specifically the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. That said, I am committed to ensuring that the United Nations continues its work in devising and elaborating upon a vigorous framework of treaties and international law which recognize, and help forestall, the links between illicit financial transfers, commerce in drugs and access to weapons of mass destruction by those intent upon using them for terror.

The international community has identified the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including the possibility that terrorists may gain access to them, as the greatest threat to international peace and security. The United Nations is uniquely placed to play a leading role in confronting this threat. A number of international treaties, like the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, and the Chemical Weapons Convention, provide the multilateral framework for combating the threats of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We need to universalize and effectively implement them. In April 2004, the Security Council passed Resolution 1540, which has obliged States to enact legislation to ensure that non-State actors are prevented from gaining access to weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery.

The United Nations and its Member States have to work in harmony to build on these successes. While the First Committee of the General Assembly continues to deliberate these issues and adopt decisions on them, the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to do any substantive work for almost a decade now. The structured discussion on the various issues on its agenda this year has imparted something of a new momentum and could, I hope, lead to ending the deadlock on the CD's programme of work as well as on the commencing of FMCT negotiations, in case the concerns and priorities expressed by the CD members are taken on board. The UN Disarmament Commission managed to hold a substantive session in 2005 after a gap of two years. Even without producing consensus-based recommendations, UNDC can perform an effective brainstorming function to catalyze further action in the First Committee and the CD.

As one who was actively involved in Kofi Annan's decision in 1997 to re-establish the Department of Disarmament Affairs, I am in favour of increasing the capacity of the UN Secretariat to respond creatively to contemporary WMD threats. But this is critically dependent on the mandate given to us by Member States. Even within the present mandate, we can and should take advantage of the experience, expertise and wisdom of the specialized bodies working in this domain, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Key parts of the United Nations, like UNDP, have added a new dimension to the Secretariat's involvement with disarmament and non-proliferation by relating development to security, especially in the context of small arms and light weapons. The Secretariat is also assisting in preparing for two significant review conferences, later this year, on the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and the Inhumane Weapons Convention, which require productive results.

Even without a specified mandate for supervision or verification, the Secretariat can play an active role by providing analytical presentations and disseminating information to create greater awareness about current issues. It can act as a clearing house for sharing of best practices and

provide assessments on whether all concerned are taking the specific measures required in line with their obligations under international instruments and the relevant Security Council resolutions to prevent WMD proliferation and the risk of their acquisition by terrorists.

I do believe that the quest for peace, disarmament and development, free from the threat of WMD proliferation, must be pursued by a committed Secretariat and by Member States, in cooperation with scientists, strategic thinkers and members of peace movements (which is why I'm happy that the NGO community has kept up the pressure for more to be done in this area). The voluntary efforts of civil society need to be supplemented by the UN Secretariat playing a crucial supportive role in these multilateral processes. Not only do we provide various services to the multilateral disarmament institutions and processes, we also compile useful reports and conduct relevant studies which help Member States in their deliberations. Issues relating to disarmament and non-proliferation affect the security of all the states, which means that the multilateral setting provided by the UN and its specialized agencies offers the most effective forum to address them, in a manner which takes into account the concerns of all.

11. UN Reform: The UN has been involved in reform discussions for the past two years. What do you see as the strengths and weaknesses of the current Secretary-General's reform recommendations (i.e. "In Larger Freedom," March 2005)? What are the most important reforms, and what role should the Secretary-General play in promoting those reforms?

My answer emerges from many of my responses to earlier questions in this dialogue, and I do not want to repeat myself. As a serving Secretariat official, I naturally stand behind the Secretary-General's proposals. But I believe that, if elected as his successor, one of my first tasks will be to take stock of the lessons learned in the reform process and move forward in a constructive way to bring about the changes that are needed to restore the world's faith in the Organization. We need reform, not because the UN has failed, but because it has succeeded enough over the years to be worth investing in. It is too early to say how effective the new changes already agreed by Member States will be -- the proof of the pudding is in the eating. But, thanks to Secretary-General Annan's efforts, we now have a recipe that should work.

The UN must be more sharply focused on areas where it has a proven and undoubted capacity to make a difference. No task is more important than reinforcing the UN's operational capacity -- to fulfill the Millennium Development Goals (which for the most part are not on course to being met), to mount effective peace-keeping operations (see my response to question 3 above), and to respond urgently to humanitarian crises (I know from my own experience with refugee work that we are doing well there, but can become the gold standard for emergency relief). Reform also means innovation: we must do more to promote democracy and good governance as essential to development -- and, little noticed in the recent reforms, we now have a Democracy Fund to help us do that, financed not just by the rich West but by countries like India.

The management of the UN requires renewal, as well as an end to any lingering practices of cronyism and nepotism. As the head of the UN, I would ensure the strengthening of the international civil service, insisting that staff of both sexes, of the highest competence and integrity, are appointed to responsible positions, with the best and the brightest representatives of the cultural diversity of our planet. As an immediate task, the new Secretary-General must work together with States on the unfinished business of management reform, especially to ensure ethics, accountability and transparency, together with truly independent audit oversight.

There's a great danger that the East-West divide of the Cold War is being replaced by a North-South divide at the UN, as developing countries resist what they see as a rich-country agenda. The new Secretary-General must promote dialogue across the lines – geographic, political, ideological – and work with Member States to search for common solutions. I believe an effective United Nations is essential as the indispensable global institution for our globalizing world. I would focus on building issue-based coalitions on specific practical problems (management inefficiencies, procurement policies, information technology, outsourcing) that have little to do with ideological politics. And I'd present member states with politically achievable proposals, knowing I'd have to implement my mandates within the means they're willing to provide.

At the same time, let us never forget that the UN will only succeed as a recourse for all and not the instrument of a few. I have already quoted Mahatma Gandhi's conviction that "you must be the change you wish to see in the world". I hope to be that change agent, and to focus on building issue-specific coalitions across the North-South divide, so we can deliver practical solutions to real problems rather than allow ourselves to be mired in turf battles.

12. UN Leadership Roles: How would you distinguish between the roles of the Secretary-General and the Deputy SG? What qualifications would you look for in a candidate for DSG? Do you already have anyone in mind for the post?

We have had two Deputy Secretaries-General so far, and each has been very different, in terms of personality, skills, background and therefore job description. I would look for a deputy who complements my experience as an insider, my strengths as a leader, as a communicator, and as a fairly experienced manager within the system. I would want somebody with a different sort of profile, different strengths in terms of professional abilities and background, from a different geographical region and ideally a different gender – an outsider who could bring governmental experience, international diplomatic experience, and management experience from outside the U.N. system. And I think that if somebody very different from me is elected, that person should bring a very different kind of deputy. Certainly somebody coming from the outside should look for a deputy who is a strong insider who knows how to make the system work. But I do not think you can start off with a job description and impose this on a deputy – you look at individuals who complement your strengths and see how you can share the workload in a way that brings out the best in both of you.

13. South versus North – Mediating Role of Secretary General: Progress on key issues is often undermined by tension between developed and developing countries. What role can the Secretary-General play in addressing that divide? What experience do you have that would aid you in the considerable task of achieving the compromises and building the consensus necessary for meaningful action?

I have partly addressed this issue in responding to your question about reform above. As a candidate from a developing country I would naturally hope to be able to relate to the countries of the G-77 and the NAM as a citizen of one of their members. Though I have never worked for the Government of India, I am honoured and gratified by its nomination of me and I hope to benefit from the active support of such an influential player on the world stage, particularly on issues of importance to the developing world. But, as I have stated before, if elected I would be an Indian Secretary-General, not India's Secretary-General. I would be accountable to all 192 Member States, whether of the North or the South, and I hope to approach my responsibilities with conviction and independence, above all as an international civil servant pledged to support both the North and the South to deliver results that benefit all. Ultimately, north and south are

perspectives dependent entirely on where one sees oneself: I dare say there is a little of both North and South in almost everyone at the United Nations.

14. Role of NGOs/Civil Society: What role should civil society and other non-state stakeholders play in the work of the UN? Do you support a greater consultative role for NGOs in intergovernmental decision-making processes, or a decreased role? What measures should a Secretary General take to improve UN-civil society relations?

I believe the time and care I have taken in responding to these very exhaustive questions from a coalition of NGOs is itself an indication of how seriously I take the role of civil society and non-State stakeholders in the work of the United Nations. In devising my proposals and expressing the ideas articulated in the 13 previous questions, I have found the imagination and contribution of non-State stakeholders not only essential, but fundamental. I would like to take a fresh look at the report of the Cardoso Panel, which has essentially been languishing since it was submitted, to see what more can be done to resurrect those of its proposals that could bring about positive change in the place of civil society organizations within the UN framework. In the Department of Public Information, I have developed and maintained excellent relations with the hundreds of NGOs affiliated to DPI, and I have been proud to offer our Organization as a convening forum where the United Nations can listen to and be enriched by the ideas of civil society. I hope that, as Secretary-General, I can broaden even further the openness of that forum.

I trust that the experience of the dialogue we have conducted through this questionnaire will both be valuable in itself and the occasion for further dialogue. I look forward to hearing the reactions and comments of your members to the propositions I have set forth above. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to engage with some of the most important issues facing the United Nations as it elects its next Secretary-General.