

STATEMENT OF
FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE NEWT GINGRICH
BEFORE THE
SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS
MONDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2005

Chairman Coleman, Ranking Member Levin, and members of the subcommittee:

I appreciate the opportunity to testify today about the current state of U.N. reform, with particular emphasis on the status of much needed management reforms.

As the subcommittee is aware, I participated as co-chair of a congressionally mandated task force on U.N. Reform with my friend and colleague former Senator Majority Leader George Mitchell. I did so because I share the belief that a dramatically reformed U.N. can be an effective instrument in the pursuit of a safer, healthier, more prosperous, and freer world – all goals which serve American interests and the interests of our democratic allies.

Since the task force issued its report on June 15, 2005 Senator Mitchell and I testified about its findings before the Science-State-Justice-Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee in the House of Representatives on June 22, 2005 and the Senator Foreign Relations Committee on July 21, 2005.

Our testimony took place prior to this subcommittee's recent reports on the Oil-for-Food scandal, as well as prior to the additional reports released by the Independent Inquiry Committee (the "Volcker Commission"), also in connection with the Oil-for-Food scandal.

This testimony also took place before the U.N. General Assembly World Summit that was convened in New York a little over one month ago and specifically charged with moving forward an aggressive U.N. reform agenda.

These intervening reports and the 2005 World Summit Outcome provide an appropriate basis to draw some conclusions about what should be the nature of the ongoing relationship between the United States and the United Nations.

And those conclusions are straightforward:

1. The results of the 2005 World Summit were not at all encouraging and the United States should insist on being honest about the manifest failures of the United Nations to reform itself. The 2005 World Summit Outcome document should be seen as a decisive failure and we can only conclude that the Secretary General's efforts at reform have clearly failed in the General Assembly.
2. Given the World Summit's failure to achieve fundamental reforms and the fact that the United States, which funds 22 percent of the U.N.'s "regular"

budget, has a special responsibility to promote accountability, transparency, and honesty, the United States should insist that henceforth all U.N. dues be made voluntary and that voluntary dues should be made a permanent change for the financing of the entire U.N. institutional system. The U.N. has forfeited any right to make non-negotiable demands for money from the U.S. taxpayer and from the taxpayers of any other member state. And because the U.N. does not have the moral authority to make non-negotiable demands on any member state, the Administration should consider submitting to Congress on an annual basis the amount of its proposed voluntary dues for the United Nations. This amount should then be subject to the normal appropriations process and subjected to the same oversight on how well the U.S. Treasury's money is spent as is the case with all other U.S. taxpayer appropriated monies.

3. Along with this move, the United States should start exploring the idea of putting together a coalition of the willing (including Japan) – a U.N. reform caucus -- on phased withholding of voluntary U.N. dues until such time as the U.N. adopts fundamental reforms that meets with the satisfaction of the U.S. Congress and other members of this coalition. This reform caucus, for example, could indicate that a limited portion of the U.N. dues of each member of the caucus will be withheld if the U.N. fails to achieve certain milestones, such as the prompt creation of perhaps the two most urgent management reforms: creation of a Chief Operating Officer and an Independent Oversight Board by the end of December 2005. The member states of this reform caucus should also together undertake a thorough evaluation of the Volker Commission report and determine what additional set of reforms should be proposed and advocated in light of its findings.
4. The Volcker Commission latest report on the manipulation of the Oil-for Food program outlines how \$1.8 billion dollars was stolen from the Iraqi people through various surcharges and kickbacks. The U.S. Department of Justice should establish an international legal task force charged with recovering for the Iraqi people the millions that were stolen by the corrupt politicians and companies who cheated the Iraqi people.
5. Given the World Summit's failure to achieve fundamental reforms, the United States should begin to aggressively encourage, at every opportunity, alternative forums for international activity. United States representatives should also take every opportunity to contrast a democratic, transparent accountable internationalism with the corruption-prone, irresponsible, dictatorship dominated, and anti-American, anti-Israel system of the United Nations. The first step should be for the United States to lead a coalition of democracies in the creation of a new Human Rights Council outside of the U.N. if the U.N. General Assembly fails to replace the thoroughly discredited U.N. Human Rights Commission with a new U.N. Human Rights Council composed of democracies by the end of December 2005.
6. The United States should continue to pursue a strong U.N. reform agenda and every American ambassador in the world should be assigned the task of lining up votes for U.N. reforms as a major goal of their diplomatic activities.

Key first tests of a new emphasis on lining up votes will be whether the U.S. can (i) lead the General Assembly in creating a new Human Rights Council as a replacement for the current U.N. Human Rights Commission by the end of December 2005, and (ii) successfully win a U.N. General Assembly vote to abolish the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and of the Division of Palestinian Rights.

7. The burden should not be on the United States to beg the United Nations to reform itself. The burden should be on U.N. member states to create a United Nations worth supporting. But to achieve these needed reforms, America must first be united in the common vision that the U.N. must be a fundamentally limited, but honest and effective institution. With such a common vision, the Congress can then forcefully act to hold the U.N. accountable for results.

The United Nations and the Long War for Civilization

You have invited me today to discuss much needed management reforms at the U.N., but let us not for a moment forget the larger context in which we are discussing the urgent need for U.N. reform.

Four years ago, terrorist enemies killed almost 3,000 innocent Americans in New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C.

Thousands of other innocents have been murdered and maimed since by terrorist enemies in London, Madrid, Beslan, Bali, Jerusalem, Baghdad, Istanbul, Sharm-el-Sheikh, New Delhi, and many other cities.

The terrorist Ayman Al-Zawahiri is explicit about Al Qaeda's "right to kill four million Americans---two million of them children—and to exile twice as many and wound and cripple hundreds of thousands."

The civilized world is in the fourth year of a global war against a committed ideological foe bent on using terror.

At the same time, genocide continues unstopped in Darfur ten years after the world vowed that Rwanda would be the last genocide.

And we have been reminded in the past two weeks that it is not only terrorists in the shadows who threaten civilization. We also continue to face the long familiar challenges from thug dictators and dictatorial regimes.

First, we learned that a U.N. authorized investigation into the murder of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri has preliminarily concluded that there is converging evidence pointing at involvement in this murder by the Syrian government.

And now just last week the President of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, publicly proclaimed that "Israel must be wiped off the map" and that a new wave of attacks in Palestine would "wipe off this disgraceful blot from the face of the Islamic world." And in the manner of a

criminal thug, the President of Iran, a U.N. member state, went on to threaten that "anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury."

Prime Minister Blair has forcefully denounced Ahmadinejad's statements, while the BBC reports that the UK Foreign Office does not regard President Ahmadinejad's statement on Israel as new policy, which appears correct. In September 2004, the New York Times reported that at a military parade featuring the Shahab-3 missile, with a range that could reach Israel, former Iranian President Khatami said that "[w]e have made our choice: yes to peaceful nuclear technology and no to nuclear weapons," Yet, the Times went on to report that the missiles at the parade behind Khatami were draped with banners that read "Crush America" and "Wipe Israel Off The Map," according to The Associated Press and Agence France-Presse.

Indeed, "wiping Israel off the face of the map" seems to be a quite conscious and consistent policy aim of the Iranian government.

Reading such statements of the Iranian leadership calls to mind the reported response of a Holocaust survivor. When asked what lesson he had drawn from the experience, he answered, "When someone tells you he wants to kill you, believe him."

We can draw only one conclusion from this litany – that we are in a long struggle for civilization. It is at once a global military fight, a diplomatic challenge, and a battle of ideas between those who would defend civilization and those who would destroy it. At every point in this long struggle, a reformed and an effective U.N. would be a tremendously ally on the side of civilization.

A U.N. that can honestly confront the challenges of this struggle, such as accurately defining terrorism and telling the truth about the Iranian nuclear program and confronting the thuggish behavior of the Iranian government, as well as honestly describing and confronting the genocide in Sudan, and other horrific human rights violations and deprivations worldwide, would contribute enormously to American safety at home and liberty abroad.

It is for these reasons that the United States is intensely interested in the progress of U.N. reform -- or the lack thereof.

Failure of 2005 World Summit

Notwithstanding a very detailed blueprint for management reform provided by the Task Force on U.N. Reform and the Secretary General, the U.N. General Assembly 2005 World Summit did not adopt any meaningful management reforms. Among many failures, the Summit failed to:

- (i) Expand and make more independent the Office of Internal Oversight Services;
- (ii) Conduct an independent evaluation of U.N. auditing and oversight;
- (iii) Create an independent oversight board;
- (iv) Adopt a code of ethics;
- (v) Establish a Chief Operating Officer; and
- (vi) Establish a Sanctions Office.

At best, the General Assembly asked the Secretary General to submit more detailed proposals on various management reforms, or promised to consider certain such reforms in the future.

Given the stakes described above, delay and deferral of much needed management reforms at the U.N. is not good enough. In wake of the Volcker Commission Report, and this subcommittee's findings in the oil-for-food scandal, the U.N.'s lack of meaningful progress on management reform borders on institutional malfeasance.

Considering the lack of urgency the General Assembly has just shown toward institutional reform, the United States should consciously and deliberately pursue a twin track approach to the United Nations.

With respect to the first track, the United States should make every effort to strengthen alternative international institutions that can more effectively deal with the international challenges that the U.N. was designed to address.

With respect to the second track, the United States should continue to make aggressive efforts to reform the U.N. In this effort, the U.S. should move to make all contributions to the U.N. voluntary and work with a coalition of the willing to coordinate a phased withholding of U.N. dues until the U.N. adopts needed reforms.

As discussed, an effective U.N. could significantly enhance American safety by helping to counter terror and nuclear proliferation, among other benefits. As noted above, the U.N. investigation into the murder of the former Lebanese prime minister is an important contribution to bringing those responsible to justice. In addition, the U.N. has made very important contributions to the holding of free elections in a number of countries. For these reasons and others, and despite its record of grievous and real failures, the U.N. is a system worth reforming rather than a system to be abandoned.

Nevertheless, while failure of U.N. reform can continue to be an outcome for the United Nations, the United States and our democratic allies need effective multilateral instruments for saving lives and defending innocent people and therefore we cannot accept continued U.N. failures to achieve meaningful reforms. The United States and its democratic allies therefore need to begin aggressively pursuing other avenues for effective action since the U.N. so far refuses to reform itself. America and its democratic allies cannot be prevented from doing the right thing by the unwillingness of other U.N. member states.

The U.S. Should Move For the Entire U.N. System To Operate With Voluntary Dues

The Administration was exactly right in raising the question in Ambassador Bolton's testimony whether we should move from an assessed contribution model to a completely voluntary dues paying model for all U.S. tax payer contributions to fund U.N. expenses.

The answer to this question is yes.

The Congress should embrace moving to a model of completely voluntary dues to the U.N. and should do so promptly.

Moving to a voluntary dues model is not an excuse to be cheap. The U.S. pays voluntary dues to the World Food Program (WFP) in a proportion substantially larger than our 22% share of the general U.N. budget. Former U.N. Under Secretary-General for Management and former head of the WFP Catherine Bertini is very persuasive in her description of the

positive impact of voluntary dues upon the effectiveness of the WFP. She noted that “voluntary funding creates an entirely different atmosphere at WFP than at the U.N. At WFP, every staff member knows that we have to be as efficient, accountable, transparent, and results-oriented as is possible. If we are not, donor governments can take their funding elsewhere in a very competitive world among U.N. agencies, NGOs, and bilateral governments.”

We need to bring to all operations and personnel of the U.N. system the knowledge that every WFP staff member has that they need to be as efficient, accountable, transparent, productive, honest, and results oriented as possible, lest donor governments determine that alternative international mechanisms offer more effective solutions and better returns for the contributions of dues paying members.

The U.S. Should Organize a U.N. Reform Caucus to Explore Phased Withholding Strategy by Milestones Achieved

The United States should work with other reform minded U.N. members in establishing a dues paying model within the United Nations. The U.S. can also work with such countries in determining the common areas of agreement on a reform agenda. In particular, the issue of sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers was not effectively addressed by the World Summit Outcome document and must be kept at the forefront of the reform agenda.

The reform caucus should also together undertake a thorough evaluation of the Volker Commission report and determine what additional set of reforms should be proposed and advocated in light of its findings.

Once a reform caucus within the U.N. has identified a common agenda, they will likely be far more persuasive with other U.N. members to achieve reform than if the United States acted alone. Moreover, the reform caucus need not threaten to withhold voluntary dues unless the entire common reform agenda is adopted all at once. It is likely wiser for the reform caucus to establish milestones for reform, and indicate that a certain portion of voluntary dues will not be voluntarily contributed to the U.N. unless such reforms are adopted by a certain time. So, instead of 50% withholding by the U.S. alone, the U.N. could be faced with the voluntary withholding of 5% of dues by a broad coalition of U.N. donor countries.

A phased withholding strategy by a reform caucus or coalition of the willing could start with advocating the immediate adoption of two of the most commonly agreed upon reforms, namely a Chief Operating Officer and an Independent Oversight Board.

The World Summit did not take action on either, and there is the danger that no action will be taken before the adoption of the biennial budget in December, which would preclude the U.N. budget from reflecting such changes for the next two years. That should not be allowed to happen. The U.S. should move aggressively to organize a coalition of the willing to insist the adoption of these two straightforward reforms, recommended by both the Volcker Commission and the Task Force on U.N. Reform, by the end of the year.

It is hard to see how the American people, or the taxpayers of any U.N. dues paying member state, will continue to tolerate paying into a system that lacks such fundamental financial safeguards and which fixes have been identified by the very independent inquiry committee named by the U.N. to look into its management practices in the Oil-for-Food scandal. The U.N. need not adopt all the desired management reforms by the end of the year, but the

most basic management reforms should be, and the United States and other reform minded U.N. member states should insist on it.

As Ambassador Bolton noted, reform is forever. Nevertheless, it needs to start, and it needs to do so with some meaningful reforms this year.

The United States Should Aggressively Develop Strong International Institutions That Provide Alternative Instruments to Save Lives and Defend Innocent People

A good example of a U.S. action with respect to pursuing the "first track" concerns the U.N. Human Rights Commission. This 53-member U.N. body has become so discredited that the United States should refuse to participate in it if the U.N. has not authorized a replacement by the end of December 2005 and should set aside the proportion of its dues that goes to subsidize it and assign those monies to an independent Human Rights Commission, which the United States should propose creating along with other democracies.

The plain and simple facts are that known human rights abusers have served on the U.N. Human Rights Commission, illustrated by the fact that today the Government of Sudan is currently serving its second term on the Commission, and that Libya, the same nation that accepted responsibility for the murder of 189 Americans in the bombing of Pan Am 103, was elected as Chair of the Commission in 2003. Moreover, between 1987 and 1988 Iraq was a member in good standing of the Commission at the very time that Chemical Ali was using mustard gas and Sarin nerve agents upon Iraqi Kurds.

In effect, the dictators and the murderers have systematically come to dominate the institution designed to bring them to justice.

Like the oil-for-food scandal, the U.N. Human Rights Commission completely undermines the integrity and decency of the entire U.N. and should be offensive to free peoples everywhere. Even Secretary-General Annan recognizes that "we have reached a point at which the commission's declining credibility has cast a shadow on the reputation of the U.N. system as a whole and where perceived reforms will not be enough."

It is for these reasons that the Gingrich-Mitchell task force unanimously called for abolishing the current Human Rights Commission and replacing it with a new Human Rights Council, which should be composed of democracies. We need to recognize, however, that given the present culture of the U.N. General Assembly, it will be a great challenge to prevent the election of human rights abusers to such a Council. That challenge will be met only if a major effort is undertaken to line up the votes of U.N. member states whose governments believe in the basic principles of human rights and are prepared to instruct their representatives at the U.N. to vote accordingly.

Since the World Summit failed to take decisive action to reform this institution, the U.S. should not wait any longer than the end of this year to withdraw from the currently constituted U.N. Human Rights Commission and lead a coalition of democracies in standing up an alternative outside of the U.N. system.

United States Representatives Should Take Every Opportunity to Contrast the Current U.N. with the Values of Democratic Internationalism

World leaders gathered last month at the World Summit, four years after 9/11, to take action to reform the United Nations so it can live up to its charter ideals of preventing war and reaffirming faith in fundamental human rights.

They failed to take sufficient action. As a result, representatives of the U.S. government should take every opportunity to draw the contrast between the U.N. that currently exists and the values of democratic internationalism that the United States will strengthen in alternative institutions.

American representatives can explain that every American who wants to avoid a repeat of 9/11, every British, Spanish, and Indonesian citizen who wants to avoid a repeat of the London, Madrid, and Bali bombings, every Israeli who wants an end to the suicide bombings, and every Iraqi who yearns to build a just and peaceful society based on the rule of law, has an interest in a dramatically reformed U.N.

Each nation's citizens need a U.N. that can be counted on as ally in the long war for civilization in which we are all unavoidably engaged.

Unfortunately, we cannot count on the U.N. in its current form, as it remains a corruption-prone, unreformed, irresponsible, dictatorship dominated, and anti-American, anti-Israel system.

How can we take the U.N. very seriously when it has thus far failed to end its second-class treatment of Israel and reject neutrality in the face of anti-Semitism. Instead, the U.N. maintains its institutional propaganda machinery responsible for the year-round, global campaign of discrimination and demonization of Israel, namely the Committee on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Human Rights Practices, the Division of Palestinian Rights, and the sub-section of the Department for Public Information on the Palestinian Issue.

U.S. representatives should not relent in pointing to this as but one example of the corruption that continues to permeate an unreformed United Nations system. The Volcker Commission and this subcommittee's reporting provides thousands of pages of additional examples that point to what Paul Volcker has termed a U.N. "culture of inaction", which has quite directly led to corruption among some of its officials and discredited the effectiveness of the institution.

By now one would think it was quite evident to all U.N. members the nature of the enemies of civilization. The same terrorists and state sponsors of terror who want to kill all the Jews in Israel are the same murderers and sponsors who are killing innocent Muslims in Iraq for wanting to build a society of free men and women. It is the same terrorists who murdered Sergio Vieira de Mello and twenty one other United Nations staff members in Baghdad.

The terrorists -- and the ideology that they represent -- neither want Jew nor Muslim, Israeli nor free Iraqi, to stand in the way of their vision of Taliban-like dictatorships throughout the Middle East.

By contrast, Israel is a country that manifests the values that the U.N. should defend and embrace, not condemn.

The United States and Israel share a special bond rooted in our democratic traditions of government, our pluralistic societies, and our common respect for faith -- not just one faith, but all faiths, and for all people of goodwill. These values are central to our national identities and unite us in a common vision for what we expect from the U.N. The U.N.'s past and current treatment of Israel has fallen dramatically short of these ideals. When the U.N. moves finally to end the second class treatment of Israel, it will provide an important indication that U.N. reform is truly moving in the right direction.

The United States Should Continue to Aggressively Work for a Fundamentally Reformed United Nations

It is essential that we recognize and fully understand the fundamentally anti-American culture that prevails at the United Nations. Diplomats from a good many countries that are friendly to the United States arrive in New York without any bias against us. But they then acculturate themselves to conditions around them. They may not be anti-American in their personal views of the United States. But they consider it necessary, so as to be accepted in their surroundings, to be elected to chairmanships and derive other benefits from their New York assignment, to oppose the United States by voice and vote.

There are, of course, diplomats in New York whose anti-American stance correctly reflects the views of their governments. But, as I have indicated, anti-American statements are often made and votes against United States positions are often cast by countries that are really good friends of ours. One diplomat was quoted to me as having said: "I didn't know anyone noticed and I didn't know anyone cared." In many instances heads of government and even foreign ministers do not have any knowledge of the votes cast by their representatives in New York. If they do know about the votes, they believe that the United States really does not care a great deal about the way their votes are cast.

Let me note here that a good many of the states that vote against United States positions are the recipients of assistance from us or are interested in trade legislation. They are aware that in providing such help we do not care about their U.N. voting practices, that there is indeed no linkage. There is good reason to believe that we are the only one of the major granters of assistance that follows that policy.

The result of this failure in capitals of friendly states to understand that the United States really cares about votes cast at the UN is well illustrated by the State Department's annual Report on Voting Practices in the United Nations. The most recent such report, on the 2004 Session of the UNGA, shows that only 10 out of the other 190 members voted, on roll-call votes, with the US 50% or more of the time. Four of them were small Pacific Island states, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, and Palau. The other six were Albania, Australia, Canada, France, Israel, and the UK.

The challenge before those of us who believe in the principles of the United Nations Charter, but who also believe that the UN as it operates today has betrayed these principles, is to effect change in the voting practices at the UNGA. I believe the United States can lead other countries in an effort to successfully reform the United Nations but it will take significant work over the long haul.

In the first place a decision will have to be made that the UN is important enough to us to link our multilateral diplomacy with our bilateral diplomacy. This will involve old fashioned diplomatic shoe leather and will require engaging in what amounts to a sustained and major worldwide whip operation contacting the governmental leadership of friendly countries to make it clear that the United States cares about how they vote at the U.N. I can readily understand that many of our Ambassadors are overwhelmed by the issues that face them day to day in dealing with the problems that relate to the relationship between the United States and the country to which they are accredited. What goes on in New York is not really on their radar screen. So, when instructions from Washington arrive that require the Embassy to present a demarche on a UN issue, the task is assigned to a junior officer.

The resultant problem is well illustrated by the remark of a head of state that has been quoted to me. "If they send in a Second Secretary," he said, "it means it is a secondary issue." It follows that if we want to make it clear that the UN is a primary issue for us, the contacts should be made by Ambassadors, Assistant Secretaries and higher, and members of Congress. This effort has been made sporadically heretofore. But what is need is s systematic concerted effort, a whip operation. That has simply not been undertaken to date.

A key first test for a concerted effort by the U.S. to win U.N. votes should be an upcoming vote in the [GA Assembly] concerning the abolishment of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and of the Division of Palestinian Rights. Ambassador Anne Patterson, U.S. Deputy Chief of Mission at the United Nations, made a statement last week that both entities are "inimical to the aim of ensuring that U.N. monies are directed to our highest priorities and in achieving a just and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict." She went on to say that the United States "strongly opposes the use of scarce U.N. resources to support the biased and one-sided political activities carried out by the Committee."

A key point to keep in mind here is that the goal to attain peace between Israel and the Palestinians is a highly important element of United States foreign policy. Looking at the Charter of the United Nations, one would think that the UN would indeed line up in full support of our policy. But, instead, it takes action that gives aid and comfort to those who stand in the way of a peaceful settlement.

Because of the importance of this issue to the realization of our foreign policy goal in the region, the United States needs to win this vote and we should go about organizing the support of our friends and allies to win it. This should be not just a matter of high importance of U.S. Ambassadors around the world, but also of every member of Congress, who can play an influential role with foreign Ambassadors assigned to Washington or with high-ranking foreign government officials whom they know. Members of Congress should take every opportunity to relay the message to these foreign representatives that we are paying attention to their vote, that their vote matters, and that we will remember how they vote.

American Interests Call for a Fundamentally Limited, but Honest and Effective United Nations

In all our efforts to reform the U.N., especially with respect to much needed management reforms, it is absolutely necessary we keep in mind our larger vision for what we expect from the U.N. Through my work on the task force, I have come to the conclusion that American interests call for a fundamentally limited, but honest and effective U.N.

The U.N. must be a fundamentally limited institution because it has no democratic accountability but has at times pretensions of asserting legitimacy akin to that of a democratic nation state. For example, large international meetings sponsored by the U.N. often aim to create new systems of "law" and new "norms" of international behavior under the guise of "global governance." These present a direct threat to American sovereignty and our system of Constitutional liberty and therefore must be rejected.

The U.N. is neither accountable nor responsible to a democratic electorate, genuine democratic institutions, nor the give and take of national democratic politics.

Our founding fathers separated power among three branches and created a system of checks and balances to hold our government accountable and keep it limited. We need only take note of the intense focus on the confirmation hearings for just one U.S. Supreme Court nominee to appreciate that the U.N. has no comparable accountability mechanism.

The Oil for Food Scandal is a perfect example why we need a limited U.N. Without democratic systems of accountability in place, Oil for Food, a program designed to provide humanitarian relief to Iraqis suffering under Saddam Hussein's rule, was grotesquely transformed into a dictatorship support program. The U.N.'s failure strengthened Hussein's rule, undermined American safety and delayed Iraqi freedom -- a result completely at odds with what was intended.

Another example for a limited role for the U.N. is the recent adoption of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. The U.S. was right to not support this convention because it will not promote cultural diversity and is surely to be misused by governments to deny their citizens' human rights, fundamental freedoms, and inhibit free trade. Article 8, for example, authorizes states to take "all appropriate measures" to protect and preserve cultural expressions" that are "at risk of extinction, under serious threat, or otherwise in need of urgent safeguarding." This will legitimize policies in countries such as China, Iran, and Cuba, further limiting what their people can watch, read, and hear and preventing the opportunity for them to make independent choices about what they value.

This Convention is anti-democratic, and is aimed at using U.N. mechanisms to domestic industries at the expense of free trade. It also creates an "International Fund for Cultural Diversity" that would be financed in part by contributions taken from the general UNESCO budget—of which the United States pays 22 percent. Therefore, the U.S. is now forced to fund a program which it did not ratify.

The U.S. needs quite simply to find ways to limit the pretensions of global governance that animate a decision to create an International fund for "cultural diversity" within a U.N. institution.

Now the U.N. wants to expand into controlling the Internet. This would further inhibit the free flow of information and ideas around the world. The internet has achieved an unprecedented level of success as a "global zone of freedom" because it has not been under any one nation or organization's control. It should not be surprising that the most ardent supporters of the U.N. regulating the internet are countries such as China and Iran. The unregulated Internet is the greatest threat to their policies and regimes.

America has every interest in limiting, not expanding, the opportunities for such mischief by the U.N.

America also requires an honest U.N.

Because so much of the U.N. behavior and culture would be indefensible if described honestly, there is an overwhelming tendency to use platitudes and misleading terms to camouflage the indefensible.

Fortunately, our new U.N. Ambassador John Bolton is unafraid to speak directly and clearly about America's values and interests. He will only be confrontational to those who defend policies that cannot stand the light of day.

For example, four years and one month after 9/11, the U.N. General Assembly still has not reached agreement on something as basic to the war on terror as a comprehensive definition of terrorism. Many member states that support terrorism have tried to derail this process by insisting that actions by individuals or irregular organizations in the context of "wars of national liberation" and the ejection of "occupying forces" should not be considered terrorism.

This is unacceptable, as it would legitimize terrorist attacks anywhere, and specifically against coalition forces in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as against Israel. Uniformed national military forces are already bound by the laws of war; we must insist on a comprehensive definition of terror that applies to individuals and irregular forces.

Forcing an honest debate in the U.N. with those countries who would defend terror tactics will expose their corrupt and dishonest values.

Congress Role In Ensuring Successful U.N. Reform

Congress can play a decisive role in achieving U.N. reform. When the Congress of the United States, which has the power of the purse, the power of law, and the power of investigation, takes U.N. reform seriously and sticks to it year after year, it will surely have a significant impact. History has shown that when the U.S. Congress legislates on U.N. reform, reform occurs.

As I have recommended before, I believe that Congress should have a much more robust presence in New York, have a much more robust interaction with the U.N. Ambassador, and have a much more robust requirement of whoever is in charge at State, as someone you can hold accountable regarding what we have done over the past three months and what is planned for the next three months. Congress has every right within our constitutional framework to notify the State Department that you want consultations on a regular basis. You cannot actually issue effective instructions, but you can demand consultations and reports.

This is important because we need to elevate U.N. reform to be a continuing and ongoing part of congressional involvement, both at the authorization and appropriation committee levels and both in the House and Senate. We further need to get more members engaged so that there is a sophisticated understanding of what has to get done, how we are going to get it done, and what we ultimately hold the executive branch accountable for.

Additionally, organizing the democracies so that we can then be in a position to systematically reform the U.N. is a significant undertaking that is going to take real time.

Having members of Congress talk with their counterparts in other countries, getting British parliamentarians, the French parliamentarians, the Germans, the Japanese, to agree that these are values we should be insisting on will be an enormous asset to the United States.

This Congress must play a key role in ensuring a successful reform of the U.N. One proposal for the Congress to move forward on U.N. reform is to pass legislation that requires an annual review by the Executive Branch that evaluates the progress of U.N. reform against a set of performance metrics. Since the task force report sets forth a number of reform recommendations, I attached as an appendix to my testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee an example of what such a U.N. reform scorecard with a set of proposed performance measures might look like with respect to the task force's reform recommendations. That list was intended to illustrate the types of performance measures the Congress could adopt; it was by no means intended to be an exhaustive list. There are surely several more inventive measures that this Congress could design.

Guided by such a set of performance measures, the Congress could hold hearings every June or July to review the U.N. reform progress report prepared by the Executive Branch that identified the progress to date. That report could then become the basis for an annual discussion on U.N. Reform at each summer's meeting of the G8, and then later at each September's meeting of the U.N. General Assembly. Following the annual hearings on U.N. reform, the Congress could adopt amendments to the score card legislation based on progress so that standards for the following year could be set forth. In this manner, Congress could develop a continuous practice of monitoring U.N. reform.

In that spirit, I have attached to this statement as **Appendix 1** a revised scorecard, which includes some additional recommendations and performance measures beyond that contained in the Task Force Report, and have noted by each recommendation what action or non-action was taken with respect to that recommendation by the U.N. General Assembly World Summit on U.N. reform.

I think the United States should enter into this process of reform for as many days as it takes, with the notion that the most powerful country in the world is going to get up every morning and is going to negotiate at the U.N., organize the democracies both inside and outside of the U.N., tell the truth, and keep the pressure up until we break through and get the kind of U.N. the people of the world deserve.

I am hopeful and confident that if the Congress moves forward in this spirit and with the level of commitment that will be required to achieve reforms, the United States can once again lead the way in designing a U.N. that will be an effective instrument in building a safer, healthier, more prosperous, and freer world.

This summer I testified that I was hopeful that the U.N. would adopt and undertake all of the necessary reform measures that would satisfy the United States and our democratic allies without the need to resort to any type of limitation on the appropriation of U.S. taxpayer funds to U.N. activities. I also testified that while I hoped it would not be necessary to use any such limitations in the U.S. relationship with the U.N., I thought that it was inevitable that limitations would be enforced by the Congress if the necessary reforms of the U.N. were not implemented in a timely way.

Since that testimony, the U.N. General Assembly had an opportunity to take timely action and it failed to act. In consequence, I believe the Congress should immediately initiate a phased withholding strategy together with other reform minded U.N. member states.

The first step is to establish the principle that all U.N. dues are voluntary.

The second step is to withhold our proportional share of the funding of the U.N. Human Rights Commission and reallocate that amount to a new body that the U.S. designates to serve the purpose of defending human rights if a new Human Rights Council composed of democracies is not established by the end of this year.

The third step is for the United States to initiate a diplomatic campaign to assemble a coalition of the willing that will agree to a more comprehensive strategy of phased withholding of U.N. voluntary dues in order to encourage fundamental U.N. reform -- milestone by milestone. The first milestone is the creation by year end of a U.N. Chief Operating Officer and an Independent Advisory Board.

If Not Now, When? If Not the United States, Who?

In closing, it warrants recounting what preceded the convening of the 2005 U.N. General Assembly World Summit that was dedicated to U.N. reform:

- (i) The High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, appointed by the U.N. Secretary-General;
- (ii) The Secretary General's report *In Larger Freedom*;
- (iii) The U.S. Congress mandated Report of the Task Force on the United Nation and its extensive consensus recommendations for U.N. reform;
- (iv) Four reports of the Independent Inquiry Committee; and
- (v) Several reports of the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

These reports outlined the enormous gravity of the challenges facing the U.N., including protecting people from genocide and weapons of mass destruction, the threat of terrorism, the sexual predation of U.N. peacekeepers, and a U.N. culture of inaction along with manifest management deficiencies that led to massive corruption in the Oil-for-Food program.

If the United Nations General Assembly was not prepared last month to pass real reforms in light of all of the problems that were so abundantly outlined in these reports, when would it possibly? It is hard to come to any other conclusion than that the U.N. General Assembly is incapable of passing real reform.

In the wake of the failure of the 2005 World Summit, the responsibility of the United States is to be direct, candid, and honest. If we are not prepared to stand up for real reform, what nation will? While the State Department has its responsibility to pursue vigorously a U.N. reform agenda, in the end it is the Congress of the United States that has the ultimate responsibility for how wisely the U.S. taxpayer's money is spent. It is the Congress that has the obligation to supervise the operation of the United Nations on behalf of the American people.

###

**AN EXAMPLE OF A U.N. REFORM SCORECARD
(With results of the 2005 U.N. World Summit)**

**Newt Gingrich
October 31, 2005**

Implementing policy effectively is ultimately as important as making the right policy. The American people have every right to expect results from our efforts to reform the U.N., not excuses.

One proposal by which the Congress can meet the rightful expectations of the American people is to pass legislation that requires an annual review by the Executive Branch that evaluates the progress of U.N. reform against a set of performance measures. Guided by such a set of performance measures, the Congress could hold hearings every June or July to review the U.N. reform progress report prepared by the Executive Branch that identified the progress to date. That report could then become the basis for an annual discussion on U.N. Reform at each summer's meeting of the G8, and then later at each September's meeting of the U.N. General Assembly. Following the annual hearings on U.N. reform, the Congress could adopt amendments to the score card legislation based on progress so that standards for the following year could be set forth. In this manner, Congress could develop a continuous practice of monitoring U.N. reform.

Unless the Congress and the Executive Branch plan back from the desired future, it will be impossible to distinguish between activity and progress toward U.N. reform.

While the task force report sets forth a number of reform recommendations, it does not provide a set of performance measures. Defining the right set of performance measures that will be evaluated annually in a public report will be critical to directing the energies of the Congress and the Executive Branch to achieve U.N. reform.

Listed below by number are the task force recommendations, followed by a proposed set of performance measures listed by letter in italics. The list of performance measures is intended to illustrate some types of performance measures the Congress could adopt; it is by no means intended to be an exhaustive list. There are surely several more inventive measures that this Congress could design for the task force recommendations, in addition to performance measures for other reform requirements that the Congress may adopt. I have added some additional, non-task force recommendations and performance measures.

Lastly, this example of a scorecard notes under each recommendation what action or non-action was taken with respect to that recommendation by the U.N. General Assembly World Summit on U.N. reform held in September.

Task Force Recommendations and Proposed Performance Measures

Saving Lives, Safeguarding Human Rights, Ending Genocide

I. Darfur, Sudan

1. Assemble a U.S. coordinated package of assistance for the African Union (AU) deployment in Darfur.

- a. Has an assistance package been defined by the Executive Branch?*
- b. Has the U.S. share of the assistance package been appropriated and authorized by the Congress?*
- c. Have U.S. NATO allies committed to making proportional contributions to such an assistance package?*
- d. Have U.N. Security Council members committed to making proportional contributions to such an assistance package?*
- e. Is the total funding amount adequate to meet the need and the objectives set forth by the Executive Branch?*
- f. Are administrative costs exceeding 15% of the appropriated funding?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

2. The U.S. government should make clear that the responsibility for the genocide in Darfur rests with the government in Khartoum.

- a. Has a demarche been issued by the State Department?*
- b. Has this message been given by the U.S. Mission to the U.N., either via the General Assembly or the Security Council?*
- c. Has the Executive Branch made this clear in public pronouncements?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

3. The United States should welcome the role of the African Union in Darfur and assist in its development as an effective regional organization that can play a growing role in dealing with crises on the African continent.

- a. Has the Department of State made this clear in public pronouncements?*
- b. Is the Department of Defense providing training and assistance to the African Union?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

4. The United States should make every effort to enhance AU capabilities in two main areas: (a) ensuring that it is adequate to the task of providing security in Darfur and protecting civilians, and (b) building on AU capabilities going forward

- a. Has funding for a Darfur assistance package been appropriated and authorized by the Congress?*
- b. Has the Department of Defense established a permanent training and assistance program for the African Union?*
- c. Is there a periodic performance review to ensure training and assistance is enhancing long-term African Union capabilities?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

5. **At the U.N. Security Council, the United States should pursue a mandate for the AU-led force that provides for the protection of civilians and authorizes the deployment of a sufficiently large military force to achieve that end.**
- a. *Has the U.S. introduced such a mandate in the Security Council?*
 - b. *Has the U.S. demanded a Security Council vote for this mandate?*
 - c. *Has the Security Council approved the mandate?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

6. **The United States should assist in establishment of a “no-fly” zone over Darfur.**
- a. *Has the Executive Branch adopted a no-fly zone policy?*
 - b. *Is the U.S. Air Force participating in the enforcement of a no-fly zone?*
 - c. *Are U.S. NATO allies participating in the enforcement of a no-fly zone?*
 - d. *Has the Sudanese air force been destroyed?*
 - e. *Have portions of the Sudanese air force, namely helicopters, been destroyed?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

7. **The United States should assist in increasing the number of troops in the AU mission.**
- a. *Has the Congress authorized funding to assist AU countries in providing a larger number of troops?*
 - b. *Have the number of troops in the AU mission increased in the last year?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

8. **The U.S. government should embrace the short-term strategic goal in Darfur of ending the ability of the militias to control the countryside so that security is adequate for civilians to return from refugee and IDP (internally displaced persons) camps to their villages and resume everyday life.**
- a. *How many civilians have returned home from refugee and IDP camps?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

9. **Perpetrators must be held accountable for war crimes and crimes against humanity.**
- a. *How many individuals have been prosecuted for war crimes and/or crimes against humanity out of the total number of individuals who have been indicted for war crimes and/or crimes against humanity?*
 - b. *What is the conviction rate?*
 - c. *What is the number of ongoing investigations of war crimes and crimes against humanity?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

10. **Press neighboring governments to cooperate with efforts to stop the killing in Darfur and not to interfere with international efforts under threat of sanction.**
- a. *Has the Department of State made this clear in public pronouncements?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 11. Encourage the pursuit of a general peace agreement in Western Sudan/Darfur.**
a. Has the Department of State made this a priority, as evidenced by the amount of diplomatic activity to achieve this end and the frequency of public pronouncements on this subject by the State Department?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 12. Support and encourage democratic reform in Sudan**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

II. Human Rights

- 1. The United Nations and member-states should agree that the most pressing human rights task today is the monitoring, promotion and enforcement of human rights and, in particular, the stopping of genocide and mass killing.**
a. Has the U.N. Security Council adopted a resolution to this effect?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit directed that these responsibilities fall upon individual states, saying that the U.N. "should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility."

- 2. The U.N. Human Rights Commission should be abolished.**
a. Has the U.N. undertaken all that is required to abolish the U.N. Human Rights Commission?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

- 3. A Human Rights Council ideally composed of democracies and dedicated to monitoring, promoting, and enforcing human rights should be created. The council should coordinate its work with the Democracy Caucus and the U.N. Democracy Fund.**
a. Has a Human Rights Council been created?
b. Is there democratic pre-condition for membership?
c. Since it is critically important that the voting mechanism that is established for election to the Council will indeed result in the election of a Council committed to the protection of human rights worldwide, are there safeguards to prevent a country that violates human rights from becoming a member of the Human Rights Council?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit directed that a U.N. Human Rights Council be created, however, it gave no directions on how it should be done, its composition, or its authority.

- 4. The U.S. Permanent Mission to the United Nations should include an official of ambassador rank whose responsibility will be to promote the efficacy of the**

Democracy Caucus within the United Nations and to promote the extension of democratic rights more broadly among member-states.

a. Has the U.S. established this position with this portfolio?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

5. The U.S. Government should support authority for the High Commissioner for Human Rights to appoint an advisory council to exchange information, develop best practices, promote human rights, and publicize offenses.

a. Has the Security Council adopted a resolution to provide this authority?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

6. The U.S. Government should support the work of national and regional courts, as well as tribunals authorized by the Security Council, as well as truth and reconciliation commissions, in identifying those responsible for mass atrocities and prosecuting, and punishing them as appropriate.

a. Has the Executive Branch provided the necessary policy guidance to make this a priority?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

III. Responsibility to Protect Your Own Citizens

1. The U.S. government should affirm that every sovereign government has a “responsibility to protect” its citizens and those within its jurisdiction from genocide, mass killing, and massive and sustained human rights violations.

a. Has the Department of State articulated this policy in public pronouncements?

b. Has the U.S. Mission to the U.N. communicated this formally in the General Assembly and the Security Council?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

2. The United States should endorse and call on the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly to affirm a responsibility of every sovereign government to protect its own citizens and those within its borders from genocide, mass killing, and massive and sustained human rights violations.

a. Has the U.S. Congress passed a resolution supporting this?

b. Has the Executive Branch affirmed this responsibility in its public pronouncements?

c. Has the U.S. Mission to the U.N. communicated this formally in the General Assembly and the Security Council?

d. Has the Security Council approved such a resolution?

e. Has the General Assembly approved such a resolution?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit made such a call.

3. Future presidents should affirm the “Not on my watch” pledge, articulated by President Bush in a notation on a document describing the horror of the Rwanda genocide.

- a. *Has the U.S. President affirmed the pledge publicly or in policy documents such as National Security Strategy or Presidential Decision Papers?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

4. **The urgent task required of all United Nation member-states, which the United States should lead, is to determine available capabilities and coordinate them so they can be brought rapidly to the fore in a crisis.**
- a. *Has the Executive Branch assigned this responsibility?*
- b. *Has the Executive Branch department responsible for this coordination prepared the document that defines and articulates available capabilities to support a crisis?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

5. **The United States should be prepared to lead the Security Council in finding the most effective action across the full range of legal, economic, political, and military tools.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

6. **The United States should take the lead in assisting the United Nations and other institutions in identifying potential assets and creating or improving mechanisms for coordination.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

7. **The United States must insist that in cases in which the Security Council is unable to take effective action in response to massive human rights abuses and/or genocide, regional organizations and member-states may act where their action is demonstrably for humanitarian purposes.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

8. **Support inclusion of language in all Chapter VII Security Council resolutions calling on member-states, regional organizations, and any other parties to voluntarily assess the relevant capabilities they can contribute to enforcement of the resolutions.**
- a. *Do Chapter VII Security Council resolutions contain this language?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

9. **Undertake a review of assistance programs to assess what bilateral action the United States can take that will enhance the capabilities of regional and other international organizations to prevent or halt genocide, mass killings, and massive and sustained human rights violations.**
- a. *Has the Executive Branch undertaken such a review and issued a public report on its findings?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 10. The U.S. government should reiterate that punishing offenders is no substitute for timely intervention to prevent their crimes and protect their potential victims.**
- a. Has the Department of State made this clear in public pronouncements?*
 - b. Has this been formally communicated in the U.N. in the General Assembly and/or the Security Council by the U.S. Mission to the U.N.?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

IV. Rapid Reaction Capability

- 1. The United Nations must create a rapid reaction capability among U.N. member states that can identify and act on threats before they fully develop. The Task Force, however, opposes the establishment of a standing U.N. military force.**
- a. Has a plan for a rapid reaction capability been developed?*
 - b. Has the plan been implemented?*
 - c. Are member states providing promised material support, i.e. troops, strategic airlift, etc., to make a rapid reaction capability viable?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit established a standing police force, and endorsed the creation of rapid reaction forces by member states and regional organizations, like the EU.

- 2. The United States should support the principle that those nations closest to a crisis have a special regional responsibility to do what they can to ameliorate the crisis.**
- a. Has the State Department made this clear in public pronouncements?*
 - b. Has this been formally communicated in the General Assembly and/or the Security Council?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 3. The United States should also provide assistance aimed at the development of regional capacity in advance of a crisis.**
- a. Is the Department of Defense expanding the advice and training missions to likely crises regions?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 4. Support discretionary authority of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (HCHR) and the Special Advisor for the Prevention of Genocide (SAPG) to report directly to the Security Council.**
- a. Has the U.S. Mission to the U.N. formally communicated this support in the General Assembly and/or Security Council?*
 - b. Has a U.N. resolution or rule been adopted to provide this authority?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit proposed doubling the budget of the HCHR's office, it also stated that it "fully support" the SAPG.

5. Ensure that the office of the HCHR and SAPG have adequate resources to rapidly investigate at the first indication of trouble.

- a. Has a U.S. government official been assigned this responsibility?*
- b. Are annual increases to their funding levels adequate?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken, other than proposing increased funding for HCHR.

6. Support linkage of early information on potential genocide, mass killing, and massive and sustained human rights violations situations to early preventive action.

- a. Have appropriate “tripwires” been defined?*
- b. Have the “tripwires” been approved by the Security Council?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit supported establishing an early warning system, but only approved action if taken through the Security Council.

In Need of Repair: Reforming the United Nations

I. General Recommendations

1. The United Nations, most importantly, needs to create an Independent Oversight Board (IOB) that would function in a manner similar to a corporate independent audit committee. The IOB would receive Office of Internal Oversight (OIOS) reports and, in consultation with the Board of Auditors and Secretariat management, would have the authority to fix the budget and approve and direct the assignments of the OIOS and of the Board of External Auditors just as an independent audit committee in the United States has such authority with respect to both the internal and external auditor. The OIOS budget must be set by an Independent Oversight Board and submitted to the General Assembly budget committee in a separate track outside the regular budget.

- a. Has the U.N. created an IOB?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Recommended a similar board, but no clear definitions or powers.

2. The United Nations must provide both the resources and the authority to OIOS to provide appropriate oversight to every activity that is managed by U.N. personnel whether or not that activity is funded by the assessments of the General Assembly or by voluntary contributions.

- a. Is there adequate funding for OIOS?*
- b. Are annual funding raises adequate?*
- c. Does the OIOS have the authority to investigate as necessary?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. Oversight reports must be accessible to member-states under guidelines that

Bold and listed by Number – Task Force Recommendations

Italics and listed by letter – Proposed Performance Measures

Bold and Underscored – 2005 World Summit Action

Appendix-8-

facilitate transparency and meet, at a minimum, the freedom of information flow between U.S. investigative agencies and the Congress.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

4. **The U.N. Secretariat needs to have a single, very senior official in charge of daily operations and filling the role of chief operating officer (COO).**
 - a. *Has a position been created or assigned this authority and responsibility?*
 - b. *Has a qualified individual been hired for this position?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

5. **The United States should insist on management capability as a fundamental criterion for the selection of the next U.N. secretary-general.**
 - a. *Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the General Assembly or the Security Council?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

6. **The United Nations needs to develop a far more robust policy for whistleblower protection and information disclosure.**
 - a. *Do U.N. standards meet U.S. standards?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The U.N. has proposed and implemented whistleblower policies similar to the best practices found in the US.

II. Budget and Programming

1. **The “5.6 Rule,” which requires the Secretariat to identify low-priority activities in the budget proposal, should be enforced and bolstered by an additional requirement that managers identify the lowest priority activities equivalent to 15 percent of their budget request or face an across-the-board reduction of that amount. The identification of 15 percent of the budget as low priority should not necessarily be interpreted as a list for elimination, but as information on what programs could be reduced in favor of higher priority mandates.**
 - a. *Is the “5.6 Rule” being followed?*
 - b. *Is the list of low-priority budget items available to member nations?*
 - c. *Has the 15% requirement and consequence been formally adopted?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

2. **The Secretariat’s leadership must demand that managers define and attempt to achieve specific outcomes. Future budgets should be tied to whether those results are achieved. The OIOS should be tasked with a larger monitoring/evaluation role to evaluate the degree to which programs are achieving their targeted results.**
 - a. *Are managers required to provide annual goals?*
 - b. *Are these goals measurable and related to effectiveness of the program?*

- c. Are managers required to provide periodic updates on the status of achieving those goals?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

- 3. The United States should support the secretary-general's plan, described in his March 21 report, to establish a Management Performance Board "to ensure that senior officials are held accountable for their actions and the results their units achieve."**
- a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the General Assembly or the Security Council?*
- b. Has it been implemented?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 4. The United States should insist upon both of the secretary-general's sunset proposals: the 1997 proposal to include sunset clauses for all major new mandates, and the proposal in the March 21 report this year to review all mandates dating back five years or more. Every mandate and program should have a sunset clause to ensure that it is regularly evaluated and continues to perform a necessary function. The sunset clauses should assume that programs will be shut down unless the General Assembly's budget committee confirms by consensus that they should continue based on a publicly available analysis identifying the program's purpose, budget, and ongoing relevance.**
- a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the General Assembly or the Security Council?*
- b. What percentage of mandates over five years old have not been reviewed?*
- c. What percentage of new mandates does not include a sunset clause?*
- d. What percentage of total mandates include a sunset clause?*
- e. How many programs have been ended?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit indicated that the U.N. is planning to review programs over five years old, however, the summit document has no provisions for instituting a sunset clause in new resolutions.

- 5. The United States should insist that the United Nations publish annually a list of all subsidiary bodies and their functions, budgets, and staff. Their budgets should be subject to the same sunset provisions that apply to other U.N. programs and activities. The United Nations should also publish budget information in a manner that lays out multi-year expenditures by program and identifies the source of funds as assessed or voluntary (including the source country) and includes in-kind contributions.**
- a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the General Assembly or the Security Council?*
- b. Is an annual list of subsidiary bodies, functions, budgets, and staffs available?*
- c. What percentage of them is subject to a five year review?*
- d. Is multi-year budget information available?*
- e. Are in-kind and voluntary contributions reported and identified by source in*

multi-year budgets?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

- 6. The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) should annually report to Congress on all U.S. contributions, both assessed and voluntary, to the United Nations.**

a. Is the report conducted and available in the public domain?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 7. The United States should work with a representative group of member-states to explore ways of giving larger contributors a greater say in votes on budgetary matters without disenfranchising smaller contributors. The consensus-based budget process has proved effective at reining in increases in the U.N. budget but not at setting priorities or cutting many obsolete items.**

a. Have meetings discussing this occurred in the last year?

b. What changes have been enacted?

c. Do the major donors have weighted voting?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 8. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) should become a more independent program with distinct rules and regulations appropriate for its operational responsibility for comprehensive peacekeeping missions. Its responsibilities must include coordination with broader reconstruction and development activities of the United Nations.**

a. Is coordination between the DPKO and broader reconstruction and development activities of the United Nations actually occurring?

b. What changes have been adopted?

c. Is DPKO more independent?

d. Has it adopted stronger codes of ethics and conduct?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: They want to establish the "Peacebuilding Commission" but it was not stated if it would coordinate with the DPKO.

III. Personnel

- 1. The United States should insist on the secretary-general's call in his March 21 report for a one-time severance program to remove unwanted, or unneeded, staff, and should monitor that program closely to ensure it is designed to remove the staff who ought to be removed.**

a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the General Assembly or the Security Council?

b. What percentage of staff is being given severance?

c. Has the severance been conducted through the existing budget?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: This was called for in the document.

2. **The United Nations should not offer permanent contracts to any new employees. The identification of redundant staff, along with other relevant recommendations in this report, should apply fully to the U.N.'s nearly 5,000 contractors and consultants.**

a. *What percentage of contracts is permanent?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. **The U.N.'s hiring practice must reflect the emphasis on competence laid out in the Charter, with geographical considerations taken into account only after the competence test is met.**

a. *What percentage of personnel has been hired based on a competency test?*

b. *Has there actually been a change in geographical representation?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Report insists upon "due regard" being given to geographical distribution, and for some positions calls for gender balance in hiring.

4. **The United States should insist that the United Nations install a more empowered and disciplined Human Resources Department that employs all the techniques of modern personnel policies.**

a. *Has such a system been adopted?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The report requested the secretary general for recommendations for change in Human Resources.

5. **The United States should support granting U.N. managers the authority to assign employees where they can be best used and amending job placement policies to permit promotional opportunities.**

a. *Has the General Assembly granted the Secretary General this authority?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

6. **The United Nations should more systematically take advantage of secondments of personnel from member-states on a pro bono basis for specified periods or tasks.**

a. *In the last year, how many personnel were on a pro bono basis for specified periods or tasks?*

b. *Is this number increasing, decreasing, or holding constant?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

7. **The General Assembly must fully implement its new requirement that candidates for positions on the U.N. Administrative Tribunal must possess appropriate qualifications before being approved.**

a. *What percentage of personnel on the U.N. Administrative Tribunal has appropriate qualifications?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

8. In criminal cases involving U.N. personnel, immunity should be waived unless the Legal Adviser to the secretary-general determines that justice is unlikely to be served in the country at issue. The Legal Adviser's report should be made available to the proposed Independent Oversight Board to ensure accountability to an independent body. Efforts must be made to find an appropriate jurisdiction elsewhere.
- a. *What percentage of criminal cases involving the U.N. is immunity not waived?*
 - b. *For each of the above cases, is the Legal Advisor's report available to the Independent Oversight Board or member states if IOB is not yet in place?*
 - c. *What was the number of cases where another jurisdiction was used?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

9. Legal fees for accused staff should only be reimbursed if the accused staff is cleared by appropriate legal processes.
- a. *What number of accused staff had legal fees reimbursed?*
 - b. *How many of those were found guilty?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

10. A new standard of personnel ethics must be developed and advertised within the United Nations. Disclosure forms must be mandatory at the P-5 level and above. Failure to disclose must be sanctioned, and sanctions clearly laid out. An Office of Personnel Ethics should be established within the Secretariat but accountable to the IOB to serve as a repository for disclosure documents. These documents must be made available to member-states upon request.
- a. *Has the Office of Personnel Ethics been established?*
 - b. *Are disclosure documents mandatory, verifiable, and available on request to member states?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit asked the secretary general to propose an independent ethics office, and develop a system wide code of ethics for U.N. personnel.

11. The United Nations must meet the highest standards of information disclosure. The United States should carefully monitor the Secretariat's current efforts to develop a comprehensive information disclosure policy.
- a. *Do the U.N. information disclosure rules meet U.S. standards?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Various references to increased transparency, but no overarching plan or goal.

12. If the United Nations is again called upon to administer a large scale sanctions regime, it should set up an effective and separate management structure, with serious audit capacity, to do so.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit calls for keeping all sanctions oversight under the Security Council.

13. The United States should work with other member-states to identify which of the operational programs now receiving funds from the assessed budget should be funded entirely by voluntary contributions.

- a. Has an entity been identified to conduct this study?*
- b. How many programs have been shifted to voluntary funding?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

14. The General Assembly's committee structure should be revised to increase its effectiveness and to reflect the substantive priorities of the United Nations, as identified in other parts of the Task Force report. Bearing in mind the recommendations of this report, the United States should review the mandates and performance of the committees with a view to identifying areas of duplication between the committees and other bodies, programs and mandates in the U.N. system.

- a. Has an entity been identified to conduct this study?*
- b. Is the number of committees smaller or larger?*
- c. How many committees have been eliminated?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

Deterring Death and Destruction: Catastrophic Terrorism and Proliferation of Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Weapons

I. U.N. Security Council

1. P-5 members should consult regularly on proliferation and terrorism issues. Frequent substantive contacts will not guarantee unanimity, but they could promote greater convergence in perceptions of the threat and facilitate more constructive engagement when difficult issues are brought before the Council.

- a. Are P-5 members regularly meeting?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

2. The Council as a whole should also meet regularly on proliferation and terrorism issues. It should receive closed-door briefings three or four times a year by the Directors General of the IAEA and OPCW, the chairs of the CTC and 1540 Committee, and other senior officials from relevant U.N. organizations.

- a. Is the Council meeting on proliferation and terrorism issues?*
- b. Is the Council receiving quarterly briefings from IAEA and OPCW, the chairs of the CTC and 1540 Committee, and other relevant U.N. organizations?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. The United States and other Security Council members should urge the 1540

Committee to move aggressively in encouraging U.N. members to put in place the laws and control measures required by U.N. Security Council Resolution 1540.

- a. Has the U.S. Mission made this clear to the 1540 Committee and in public pronouncements?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

4. The United States should press within the Council for improving the effectiveness of the U.N.SCR 1373's Counterterrorism Committee.

- a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

5. The United States should promote the "naming of names" that is, the United States should push the Security Council to have the 1373 Committee publicly list state sponsors of terrorism.

- a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission in the Security Council?*
b. Has the 1373 Committee publicly listed state sponsors of terrorism?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

6. The United States should take the lead in the Council to rationalize the work of the three Security Council committees responsible for terrorism and proliferation under three separate resolutions (1267, 1373, and 1540).

- a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council?*
b. Has the Security Council rationalized the work of these committees to the satisfaction of the State Department?
c. Are there still overlaps and areas of missed responsibility for these committees?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

7. The United States should also take the lead in the Council on steps to strengthen international verification such as it is in the nonproliferation fields. If the IAEA or OPCW Technical Secretariat, respectively, is unable with existing authorities to resolve whether a particular country is in compliance, the Council will meet immediately with a view to providing authorization, under Chapter VII, to utilize much more extensive, supplementary verification methods (e.g., comparable to those authorized for use in Iraq by U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441).

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

8. The Council should also strengthen the U.N. secretary-general's existing authority to initiate field investigations of alleged violations of the Geneva

Protocol or the Biological Weapons Convention by making it mandatory for states to grant prompt access and provide full cooperation.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

9. **To carry out the more robust supplementary verification activities in the nuclear and chemical fields that may be authorized by the Security Council, the IAEA and OPCW should be prepared to make available on short notice inspectors who are specially trained in more rigorous verification methods. In the biological weapons area, where no comparable verification organization exists, the Council should establish and train a roster of specialists who would be available immediately in the event that the Council or secretary-general (under his authority to initiate CW or BW investigations) activated them.**

a. Has a roster of biological specialists been established?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

10. **The U.S. should support a Council instruction to U.N.MOVIC and the IAEA to document and archive information on the investigation of Iraqi WMD programs begun in 1991, with a mandate to complete the task within six months.**

a. Has such a Council instruction been issued?

b. Have member-states received legal advice on the Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

11. **On the critical subject of the nuclear fuel cycle and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States should continue to promote the Bush administration's initiative to prevent the acquisition of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing facilities by additional countries.**

a. Has this been vigorously promoted by the Department of State?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

12. **The United States should encourage the Council to strengthen legal authorities to interdict illicit WMD-related shipments and disrupt illicit WMD-related networks.**

a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

13. **The United States should urge Council action to discourage and impede unjustified use of the NPT's withdrawal provision, which allows a party to leave the treaty after 90 days if it asserts that remaining in the treaty would jeopardize its supreme interests.**

Note: *This may be applicable only when a nation attempts to withdraw from the NPT.*

a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the

Security Council?

b. Has the Security Council to action to discourage this behavior?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

14. The Council should develop a menu of penalties that would be available for future Council consideration in individual cases of violations.

a. Has the Security Council developed a menu of such penalties?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

II. U.N. General Assembly

1. The General Assembly should move expeditiously to adopt a definition of terrorism along the lines recommended by the High-Level Panel and endorsed by the secretary-general. On the basis of that definition, the Assembly should proceed as soon as possible to conclude a comprehensive convention on terrorism. The definition of terrorism should cover the actions of individuals or irregular organizations, rather than armies since the latter are bound by the rules of war and need not be covered by additional language prohibiting terrorism. Although international consensus on the basis of the formulation contained in the High-Level Panel would be a major step forward, the definition of terrorism should ideally also cover acts of violence against noncombatant military units—for example, those deployed to a given country as part of a U.N.-authorized peacekeeping force or those present on foreign soil only to provide training or receive logistics support.

a. Has the General Assembly adopted a comprehensive definition of terrorism acceptable to the United States no later than the 2005 General Assembly?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: While condemning terrorism, the summit does not define it, however it does allow that creating a commission to consider the issue should be considered.

2. The Terrorism Prevention Branch of the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime (U.N.ODC) should be encouraged to intensify its efforts to promote wide adherence to the international conventions on terrorism, especially the new Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, and to provide member-states legal advice on domestic implementing legislation necessary to make those conventions effective.

a. Have member-states received legal advice on the Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

III. International Atomic Energy Agency

1. The United States should continue pressing for establishment of a committee of the IAEA Board to review the Agency's role in monitoring and promoting

Bold and listed by Number— Task Force Recommendations

Italics and listed by letter – Proposed Performance Measures

Bold and Underscored – 2005 World Summit Action

Appendix-17-

compliance with nuclear nonproliferation obligations.

- a. *Has a committee of the IAEA Board actually been established?*
- b. *Have the results of the review been published?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

2. **The IAEA and its Board should strongly promote universal ratification and rigorous enforcement of the Additional Protocol. Nuclear Suppliers Group members can assist in this effort by adopting a guideline that makes adherence to the Additional Protocol by recipient states a condition for nuclear cooperation.**

- a. *Has the IAEA and its board issued a statement on universal ratification and enforcement of the Additional Protocol?*
- b. *Has such a guideline been established by the Nuclear Suppliers Group?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. **IAEA Board members should urge that the Agency's relatively new function of investigating nuclear trafficking networks be expanded.**

- a. *Has the IAEA Board issued a statement on expanding its role in investigating nuclear trafficking networks?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

4. **The United States and other Board members must strongly encourage the IAEA to assign higher priority to nuclear security.**

- a. *Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council, the General Assembly, or directly to the IAEA?*
- b. *Have any other board members taken similar action?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

5. **The IAEA and its Board should examine means of assuring countries that renounce the right to possess their own enrichment and reprocessing capabilities that they will have reliable access to nuclear reactor fuel supplies.**

- a. *Has the IAEA undertaken such a study?*
- b. *Has the IAEA communicated the results to member states?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

IV. Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)

1. **The missions of OPCW and its Technical Secretariat should be adjusted to deal more heavily with the nonstate actor chemical weapons threat.**

- a. *Have the missions been so adjusted?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

2. **OPCW should become a partner of the 1540 Committee to help it implement U.N.**

Security Council Resolution 1540's requirements in the chemical area as in the case of the IAEA for nuclear issues, including taking the lead in assisting in establishing international standards for legislation criminalizing CW-related activities by nonstate actors. It should assist the Committee in the area of physical protection, assessing the adequacy of security and accountancy measures at declared chemical weapons storage depots and developing international standards for protecting chemical industry plants against theft or sabotage. With respect to the reports countries are called upon to submit under 1540, the OPCW would assist in evaluating performance, suggesting improvements, and coordinating assistance efforts.

- a. *Has the OPCW provided assistance in evaluating 1540 mandated reports?*
- b. *Has the OPCW made suggestions and coordinated assistance to member states based on its evaluation of 1540 reports?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. **The United States and other CWC parties should request OPCW's Technical Secretariat to examine the potential for state and nonstate actors to use new technologies, such as micro-reactors and novel chemical agents, for CW purposes and make recommendations on whether and how the CWC regime can be modified to keep up with the evolving CW proliferation threat.**

- a. *Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council, the General Assembly, directly to the OPCW, or directly to the OPCW's Technical Secretariat?*
- b. *Have other CWC parties taken similar action?*
- c. *Has the OPCW's Technical Secretariat undertaken such a study?*
- d. *Has the OPCW's Technical Secretariat made recommendations based on the study?*
- e. *Have those recommendations been acted on?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

V. World Health Organization (WHO)

1. **While the WHO should strengthen its existing public health capabilities that are also relevant to reducing the biowarfare threat, consideration should urgently be given to establishing a new U.N. organization responsible for dealing with biological weapons issues.**

- a. *Has a study on establishing a new U.N. organization for dealing with biological weapons been completed?*
- b. *Has the WHO increased existing public health capabilities that are relevant to biowarfare?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

2. **WHO should undertake a major upgrading of its global disease surveillance and response network. The United States should be prepared to take the lead in persuading other donor governments to commit the additional resources required. Informal arrangements should be worked out so that, in the event of a**

suspicious disease outbreak that seemed to be the result of intentional BW use, WHO could immediately notify the new U.N. biological warfare organization and the U.N. secretary-general, who would be in a position to dispatch biowarfare experts to assist WHO in its investigation.

a. *Has WHO upgraded its global disease surveillance and response network?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: They committed to upgrading the infrastructure of individual nations, but not of the world as a whole, nor did they propose any plans to link it all together.

3. **The new U.N. organization responsible for countering the biowarfare threat would work with the 1540 Committee and relevant international health organizations, including WHO, to develop common international biosecurity standards, both with respect to ensuring that only bona fide scientists have access to dangerous pathogens and ensuring that facilities engaged in legitimate research with dangerous pathogens have adequate physical security measures in place.**

a. *Have common international biosecurity standards been established?*

b. *Do only bona fide scientists have access to dangerous pathogens?*

c. *Do dangerous pathogens have adequate physical security measures?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

4. **The new biowarfare organization should also work with the WHO and other international scientific organizations to develop international guidelines or standards for reviewing, approving, and monitoring dual-use bioscientific research projects, particularly in the area of genetic engineering, that could produce results that could be applied by states or terrorist groups to offensive BW purposes.**

a. *Do international guidelines exist for reviewing, approving, and monitoring dual-use bioscientific research projects?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

VI. Conference on Disarmament (CD)

1. **The CD has outlived its usefulness and should be disbanded. Instead of having a single multilateral negotiating body take its place, the Security Council should, as the need arises, set up ad hoc bodies of manageable size to take on discrete, narrowly defined tasks, such as negotiating a treaty banning further production of fissile materials or developing common international standards for biosecurity.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action directly, however the CD would be examined along with all other mandates older than 5 years if that step is taken as proposed in the summit document.

War and Peace: Preventing and Ending Conflicts

Bold and listed by Number – Task Force Recommendations

Italics and listed by letter – Proposed Performance Measures

Bold and Underscored – 2005 World Summit Action

Appendix-20-

I. U.N. Peacekeeping: Doctrine, Planning, and Strategic Guidance

- 1. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations should develop doctrine that recognizes the need for capable forces in the new security environments in which peacekeepers are mandated by the Security Council to operate, and the United States should press for member state acceptance of these new realities and their resource implications.**

- a. Has the Department of Peacekeeping Operations developed the doctrine?*
- b. Has the Department of Defense provided advice in the development of this doctrine?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: They commended the EU for developing regional training, and expressed the desire to have the African Union troops improved over the next 10 years.

- 2. More broadly, the United Nations should develop doctrine and strategy for multidimensional peace operations that thoroughly integrate the security dimension with economic and political development requirements. Prior to deployments, a strategic assessment of the crisis situation should be made to determine the full range of measures necessary to effectively address the causes of the crisis. Strategic mission plans should precede deployments, and should be drafted by senior-level mission strategy groups brought together prior to missions.**

Note: This may only be applicable as future peacekeeping operations evolve.

- a. Has the U.N. developed a multi-dimensional strategy for peace operations?*
- b. Does a strategic mission plan exist for each peacekeeping operation?*
- c. Was this plan drafted by senior-level mission strategy groups prior to executing the peacekeeping mission?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

II. Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

- 1. The United Nations must quickly implement a policy of zero tolerance of sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers. The United States should strongly support implementation of reform measures designed to ensure uniform standards for all civilian and military participants in peace operations; training programs relating to sexual exploitation and abuse; increased deployment of women in peacekeeping operations; deployment of established (rather than “patched together”) units to peacekeeping operations; accountability of senior managers; effective data collection and management; victim’s assistance; staffing increases to enhance supervision; and organized recreational activities for peacekeepers.**

- a. Is there a policy of zero tolerance of sexual exploitation?*
- b. Are there training programs for U.N. civilians and military?*
- c. Are established units deploying to support U.N. operations?*
- d. Is there a victim’s assistance program?*
- e. Is data being collected?*
- f. Are recreational activities being provided for peacekeepers?*

Bold and listed by Number – Task Force Recommendations

Italics and listed by letter – Proposed Performance Measures

Bold and Underscored – 2005 World Summit Action

Appendix-21-

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit condemned sexual abuse and called for a comprehensive plan of “victims’ assistance” for those abused by U.N. staff. No plan to prevent such activities or punish the perpetrators was proposed or called for.

2. **While these measures have recently been endorsed by member-states, the United States should urge generous budgetary support for these initiatives, and should also press for independent investigative capacity.**
 - a. *Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council or General Assembly?*
 - b. *Is there an independent investigative capacity?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

3. **The United States should seek to ensure effective programs of assistance for victims who make substantial claims, even when neither the victim nor the United Nations is able to obtain redress from the perpetrator of the abuse.**
 - a. *Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council or General Assembly?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

4. **States that prove unwilling or unable to ensure discipline among their troops should not be permitted to provide troops to peacekeeping missions.**
 - a. *Has a U.N. resolution or rule change implementing this policy been adopted?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

III. Rapid Deployment

1. **While the Task Force does not endorse a standing U.N. military force, member states must increase substantially the availability of capable, designated forces, properly trained and equipped, for rapid deployment to peace operations on a voluntary basis. The Secretariat should enhance its capacity to coordinate increases in member state contributions to the Stand-by Arrangements system.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit commended the EU efforts to develop such forces, and also called on the U.N. to develop a police force.

2. **The United States should sustain and strengthen its support for regional peacekeeping capacity building, such as the Global Peace Operations Initiative.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

3. **The Department of Defense should prepare policy options for U.S. support of capacity enhancements and for U.S. engagement in peace operations consistent with U.S. national interests.**
 - a. *Has the DOD prepared policy options to support capacity enhancements and*

for U.S. engagement in peace operations?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

IV. The U.N. Role and Capacity in Conflict Mediation and Peacebuilding

- 1. To enhance support for U.N. efforts at conflict mediation and negotiation, the United States should support an increase in resources for the Department of Political Affairs (DPA), following an independent study providing a strategy for enhancing DPA capacity and improving coordination with DPKO.**
 - a. Has an independent study of the DPA and DPKO been conducted?*
 - b. Have the results been provided to the member-states?*
 - c. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council or General Assembly?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit proposed exactly this policy.

- 2. To enhance support for postconflict peacebuilding activities, the United States should support the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission, a Peacebuilding Support Office, and a voluntary peacebuilding support fund.**
 - a. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council or General Assembly?*
 - b. Has a Peacebuilding Commission been created?*
 - c. Has a Peacebuilding Support Office been created?*
 - d. Has a voluntary peacebuilding support fund been established?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 3. The United States should also encourage member governments with expertise in peacebuilding activities, such as those related to rule of law, to play lead nation roles on these issues in particular peace operations.**
 - a. Has the U.S. Congress passed a resolution communicating this?*
 - b. Has this been formally communicated by the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in the Security Council, General Assembly, or directly to relevant members?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit endorsed involving those nations which have “experienced post-conflict recovery” in the Commission.

- 4. The Task Force supports an increase in funding for the peace operation-related activities of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the U.N.’s Electoral Assistance Division.**
 - a. Has funding increased for the peace keeping activities of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the U.N.’s Electoral Assistance Division?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit endorsed a doubling of the budget of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, though it was stipulated that the staff should be balanced both geographically and by gender.

V. U.S. Capacity in Civilian Postconflict Stabilization Activities

- 1. To enhance U.S. ability to support postconflict reconstruction and to coordinate its efforts with the United Nations and other governments, the United States should strengthen the new State Department Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, and Congress should provide it with resources necessary (and requested by the administration) to play its coordination role.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

VI. Sanctions

- 1. Sanctions must be part of an overall strategy that integrates diplomacy and coercion in an informed and effective manner, and must be carefully targeted to avoid unintentional impacts, punish perpetrators of abuses and illegality, and create incentives for change. Member-states and the Secretariat must develop dedicated capacities for sanctions analysis, implementation and enforcement.**
 - a. Does the U.S. have dedicated capacities for sanctions analysis, implementation, and enforcement?*
 - b. Do other member states?*
 - c. Does the Secretariat have a dedicated capability for sanctions analysis, implementation, and enforcement?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit agreed with these general goals, however did not offer mechanisms to implement such a policy.

Helping People and Nations: Development and Humanitarian Assistance

I. General Recommendations

- 1. The U.S. Department of State should be the policy leader for development and humanitarian assistance issues, especially with respect to coordinating U.S. Government support to multilateral organizations.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 2. Enhance the predictability and coherence of U.S. support of U.N. assistance.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 3. Place greater emphasis on external evaluation of U.N. development and humanitarian programs.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

II. Reducing Poverty

Bold and listed by Number – Task Force Recommendations
Italics and listed by letter – Proposed Performance Measures
Bold and Underscored – 2005 World Summit Action

Appendix-24-

- 1. Push the United Nations to balance the interest in poverty reduction with an interest in governance and economic growth.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit acknowledged the need for good governance at the national and international level.

- 2. The U.S. Department of State's new office for the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) should establish a collaborative relationship with the U.N. Peacebuilding Commission, if such a new body is created as part of U.N. reform.**

Note: This action requires that a U.N. Peacebuilding Commission be established.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 3. Reorient the mission and activities of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), giving it a clearly focused mission.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit outlined the mission of the ECOSOC, and stated that it should change from its current form, but did not express what actual changes should take place.

- 4. ECOSOC should eliminate the practice of secret voting by members, and the Department for Economic and Social Affairs should be streamlined.**

- a. Does ECOSOC continue secret votes?
- b. Are the Department for Economic and Social Affairs more streamlined than before?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

III. Containing Disease

- 1. Strengthen the U.N. relationship with the World Bank.**

- a. *Are regular meeting taking place between World Bank and U.N. representatives?*
- b. *Are the World Bank and U.N. publishing coordinated documents, plans, and policies?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit endorsed having representatives of the World Bank on the Peacebuilding Commission.

- 2. Connect the U.N. Development Group (U.N.DG) with the equivalent executive bodies dealing with humanitarian and peacekeeping operations.**

- a. *Are the representatives from the U.N. Development Group (U.N.DG) and equivalent humanitarian and peacekeeping executive bodies meeting regularly?*
- b. *Are the U.N.DG and equivalent humanitarian and peacekeeping executive bodies publishing coordinated documents, plans, and policies?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. Empower resident coordinators with regard to sector-wide strategies and budgets.

- a. Are resident coordinators producing and publishing sector-wide strategies?*
- b. Are resident coordinators actually exercising day-to-day influence over their budgets?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Recommended by the summit.

4. Apply new business models for delivering assistance, including greater partnership between U.N. agencies and the private sector.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: While they welcomed the contribution of the private sector they did not embrace private sector models.

5. Rationalize and simplify the funding of U.N. Programs.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No cohesive policy on this matter was articulated.

6. The Consolidated Appeals Process (CAPS) model—which greatly improves transparency and improves the ability of member governments to donate to priority programs—should be replicated beyond its current application in humanitarian relief to other domains of U.N. assistance, such as child survival, peace-building, rule of law, postcrisis recovery (including demobilization and reintegration of soldiers), and disaster risk mitigation.

- a. Has the CAPS model been applied to child survival?*
- b. Has the CAPS model been applied to peace-building?*
- c. Has the CAPS model been applied to rule of law?*
- d. Has the CAPS model been applied to postcrises recovery?*
- e. Has the CAPS model been applied to disaster risk mitigation?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

7. Allow leading U.N. officials and resident coordinators to appoint the personnel they wish, but hold them accountable for the mission and results.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: The summit called for giving “appropriate authority” to such officials, without defining the amount of latitude.

8. U.N. field offices should be encouraged to continue moving toward common services.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

9. Establish third-party and independent mechanisms for auditing as well as for monitoring and evaluation.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

10. Strengthen the lead coordinating role of WHO in combating infectious diseases.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

- 11. WHO should operate in all areas of the world. Taiwan, for instance, is excluded from WHO membership due to the opposition of China. This deprives the organization of valuable resources and significantly impedes the fight against the SARS epidemic and other infectious diseases. Taiwan should have the closest possible association with WHO.**

a. Is WHO operating in Taiwan?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

- 12. Strengthen and mandate U.N.ICEF to regain the lead it once had, ten years ago, in the global efforts for child survival and against hunger and nutritional deficiency diseases.**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

IV. Alleviating Disaster

- 13. Re-engineer the relief architecture of the U.N..**

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

- 14. Require that 15–20 percent of disaster funding be spent toward risk reduction and mitigation.**

a. What is the actual percentage of disaster funding being spent on risk reduction and mitigation?

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken, though they affirmed the need to help nations suffering from disasters.

**Non-Task Force Recommendations and
Suggested Performance Measures**

Rejection of the Anti-Democratic Elite Global Governance Movement

- 1. A coalition of genuine democratic nation states led by the United States should explicitly and consistently reject a growing anti-democratic international movement of elite groups that seeks to create a system of rules and “laws” of “global governance” using international venues to undermine and limit American rights and the American Constitution.**
 - a. Do official U.N. documents promote the concept of “global governance” as superior to the concept of “democratic sovereignty” or the principle that the highest political authority resides in the self-governing democratic state?*
 - b. Do official U.N. documents claim to speak for the “people of the world,” although they have no democratic authority to do so?*
 - c. Do U.N. Treaties and Conventions ever propose to restrict the individual rights of the citizens in democratic states, more than the elected officials of those states themselves?*
 - d. Do U.N. Treaties and Conventions grant special privileges to non-democratic organizations, including NGOs in their relationship with democratic nation-states?*
 - e. Do U.N. Treaties, Conventions, agencies and officials grant special privileges to NGOs that are inconsistent with the vision of the founders of the United Nations?*
 - f. Are NGOs ever seen as a substitute for the democratic nation-state by U.N. agencies and officials?*
 - g. Does official U.N. literature continue to promote the amorphous concept of “global governance” that implies that there is a layer of legitimate political authority above the democratic nation-state?*
 - h. Does official U.N. literature continue to promote the amorphous concept of “global civil society” which fails to distinguish among democratic nation-states, undemocratic regimes, and the constitutional limits and political accountability within a democratic state?*
 - i. Do the populations of democratic nation-states subsidize the promotion of “norms” and “values,” (throughout the world and within their own countries), by unaccountable U.N. officials that are overwhelmingly opposed by tax-paying populations of these democratic states?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

- 2. The United States should explicitly affirm the principle of “democratic sovereignty” as a core universal principle in all international and global relations, and as central to the administration of the United Nations.**
 - a. Has the U.N. internalized and promoted in its official documents the concept of “democratic sovereignty?”*
 - b. Has the U.N. recognized in its official documents that democratic legitimacy comes only from the democratic nation-state?*
 - c. Does the U.N. recognize in its official documents that the democratic nation-state is the most democratic of all institutions, that is to say, that the democratic nation-state is more democratic than NGOs, international organizations, and the bureaus and institutions of the United Nations itself? Is this recognition of*

the centrality of the democratic nation-state to democratic legitimacy clear in the official U.N. documents?

- d. *Do U.N. rapporteurs in monitoring the compliance of democratic nation-states to various U.N. conventions and treaties promote the enactment of measures that are inconsistent with the democratic procedures of the country involved? It would be necessary to examine the reports of rapporteurs on U.N. conventions and treaties on, for example, civil liberties, torture, racial discrimination, children, women, from democratic states such as the US, Britain, Israel, Australia, Belgium, Chile, Czech Republic, etc.*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: Not Applicable.

Ending U.N. Discrimination against Israel

1. Any Reform of the U.N. Must Extend to Israel.

- a. *Has Israel been granted full membership?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

2. The U.N. must abolish all of the U.N. machinery responsible for the year-round, global campaign of discrimination and demonization of Israel.

- a. *Has the Committee on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People been abolished?*
- b. *Has the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices been abolished?*
- c. *Has the Division of Palestinian Rights been abolished?*
- d. *Has the sub-section of the Department for Public Information on the Palestinian Issue been abolished?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

3. The U.N. must end the one sided U.N. approach to the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict.

- a. *Has the U.N. adopted a comprehensive definition of terrorism that encompasses terrorist organizations and sponsors of terrorism against Israel?*
- b. *Has the U.N. adopted a comprehensive definition of terrorism that encompasses all organizations and organizations set out in the lists of the U.S. Department of State?*
- c. *Has the U.N. applied Chapter VII sanctions against organizations and state sponsors of terror against Israel?*
- d. *Has the U.N. removed any language in its resolutions that are one-sided and which purport to dictate results of final status negotiations between the parties, such as describing Israel as an occupying force, failing to take account of the successive wars of self-defense that Israel has been required to fight since its creation and the ongoing threats to its security?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

4. The U.N. must take strong action to combat the scourge of anti-Semitism.

- a. *Has the General Assembly adopted a resolution dedicated specifically to combating all forms of anti-Semitism?*
- b. *Has the General Assembly or the Secretary General commissioned a report to investigate, describe and provide recommendations on combating anti-Semitism?*

- c. *Has the Human Rights Council taken action to investigate and combat anti-Semitism?*
- d. *Has the U.N. eliminated funding for follow-up of the Durban World Conference Against Racism, including in the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, which fomented anti-Semitism and the demonization of Israel?*

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.

5. **The High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, appointed by the U.N. Secretary-General offered a sharp critique of the work program of the U.N. General Assembly. Its words are important to note:**

“The keys to strengthening the General Assembly’s role are focus and structure. Its norm-making capacity is often squandered on debates about minutiae or thematic topics outpaced by real-world events. Its inability to reach closure on issues undermines its relevance. An unwieldy and static agenda leads to repetitive debates. Although some resolutions such as the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 2000 United Nations Millennium Declaration are highly significant, many others are repetitive, obscure, or inapplicable, thus diminishing the credibility of the body. But detailed procedural fixes are not going to make the General Assembly a more effective instrument than it is now. That can only be achieved if its Members show a sustained determination to put behind them the approach which they have applied hitherto.

Member states should renew efforts to enable the General Assembly to perform its function as the main deliberative organ of the United Nations. This requires a better conceptualization and shortening of the agenda, which should reflect the contemporary challenges facing the international community. Smaller, more tightly focused committees could help sharpen and improve resolutions that are brought to the whole Assembly.”

The Panel should be asked to reconvene and spell out in detail a set of recommendations for a fundamental restructuring of the U.N. General Assembly’s work program.

2005 World Summit Outcome Action: No action taken by the U.N.