

Appointing the UN Secretary-General: The Challenge for the Security Council



By a vote of ten to none, with one abstention, the Security Council decided to recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of Dag Hammarskjöld (Sweden) as UN Secretary-General in 1953. (UN Photo)

2016, No. 4
30 June 2016

This report is available online at securitycouncilreport.org.

For daily insights by SCR on evolving Security Council actions please subscribe to our "What's In Blue" series at whatsinblue.org or follow [@SCRtweets](https://twitter.com/SCRtweets) on Twitter.

Introduction

On 16 October 2015, Security Council Report published a report on "Appointing the UN Secretary-General". It provided background on the history of the process and procedure, and on proposals for change. It also described developments since the selection of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in 2006 and relevant Security Council discussion up to early October.

In this report, we examine the major developments that have occurred since October 2015 in both the General Assembly and the Security Council. A formal nomination process has been instituted; the details and vision statements of

the 11 candidates nominated by the time of writing have been made publicly available; and they have all participated in webcast interactive dialogue sessions with the full UN membership. The Council has agreed to meet candidates at their request, has had informal meetings with two candidates and expects to meet others in the near future.

The Council has discussed the timing and procedure for straw polls—its informal procedure for testing the viability of candidatures—and has decided to hold its first straw poll on 21 July. This report traces the evolution of straw polls and

Introduction (con't)

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Part I: Developments during October 2015-June 2016
- 4 Part II: General Assembly Activities
- 5 Part III: Security Council Activities
- 6 Part IV: Formal Ballots and Straw Polls
- 9 Part V: Issues and Options
- 10 Part VI: Council Dynamics
- 10 Conclusion
- 11 UN Documents and Useful Additional Resources

provides answers to some commonly-asked questions about straw polls and formal ballots informed by past practice.

The report goes on to highlight some of the key issues for the Council in the appointment of the Secretary-General and provides analysis of current Council dynamics regarding the process.

We have used UN documents; other

published material, including autobiographies of former Secretaries-General and participants; and research interviews with individuals involved in the process in the past. We try to provide an accurate picture of the procedure and details of the past selections, but the highly secretive nature of this process has made it difficult to verify some historical information.

Part I: Developments during October 2015-June 2016

Joint Letter

General Assembly resolution 69/321 adopted on 11 September 2015 called for the Security Council and the General Assembly presidents to start the Secretary-General appointment process through a joint letter describing the process. Soon after the adoption of this resolution, it became clear that a number of Council members were keen to see the text finalised before the end of the year, although Russia preferred to wait until 2016 when the composition of the Council that would make the appointment was in place. Elements of a draft joint letter were first broached by the president of the General Assembly at the monthly meeting of the presidents of the Council and the General Assembly during the Spanish presidency in October 2015. In November, the UK as Council president discussed in the monthly meeting of the two presidents a draft reflecting elements from the president of the General Assembly which it intended to propose. Following this meeting, further inputs from the Office of the President of the General Assembly were incorporated into the draft text. On 16 November, the draft letter was circulated to all 15 members, and on 18 November Council members met to discuss the draft text under “any other business”. This was followed by three revisions of the draft text, which was put under silence on 3 December. Russia, however, broke silence as it still had a number of unresolved issues. Finally, following a meeting between Russia, the UK and the president of the General Assembly on 9 December to discuss final unresolved issues, a draft was put under silence procedure on 12 December.

Besides reactions from some members,

particularly China and Russia, that the UK draft joint letter went beyond General Assembly resolution 69/321, the most controversial issues during negotiations revolved around the inclusion of a timeline for different steps in the appointment process, how to specify qualities expected of a UN Secretary-General, references to geographic balance or rotation, references to gender, the question of Council meetings with candidates and whether only member states could nominate candidates.

With regard to the timeline, China and Russia were of the view that the 2016 appointment process should follow closely that of 2006. That year, the Council conducted its first straw poll at the end of July and made its decision on its recommendation in October. Russia was also against including specific details for the timeline of the process, such as a deadline for nominations, timeline for informal dialogues of the General Assembly, and when the process for the appointment of the Secretary-General should be concluded. The agreed language in the final draft was that the selection process would begin “by the end of July”, keeping open the possibility of an earlier start, and that the Council plans to make its recommendation to the General Assembly “in a timely manner so that appointment by the General Assembly allows the newly appointed Secretary-General sufficient time to prepare for the job.”

The issue of how to refer to geographic balance was also contentious. It seems that Russia wanted to refer to a ‘tradition of geographic rotation’ rather than to “the need to ensure equal and fair distribution based on...geographical balance”, noting that this was used in resolution 69/321 in reference to the appointment of the executive heads

Part I: Developments during October 2015-June 2016 (con't)

of the UN, not just the Secretary-General. The eventual compromise was to “note the regional diversity in the selection of previous Secretaries-General”.

Russia held strongly that only member states should be able to nominate candidates and wanted the joint letter to state this clearly. In the end, the joint letter stated that member states were encouraged to present candidates.

A final issue was whether informal dialogues and meetings with the candidates might be organised by Council members, other than the president. The UK, which had publicly stated that it would use the Arria-formula format for meetings with candidates in early 2016, and does not have a 2016 presidency, was particularly keen to have a formulation which left open this possibility. The final draft stated that, “The President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council will offer candidates opportunities for informal dialogues or meetings with the members of their respective bodies...”.

The letter was issued on 15 December 2016, signed jointly by General Assembly president Mogens Lykketoft (Denmark) and Council president for December, Ambassador Samantha Power (US).

Nomination of Candidates

Following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 69/321 and the joint letter, a clearly defined nomination process has been put in place for the first time, with greater involvement from the General Assembly. Even before the joint letter was issued, two candidates had been nominated by their governments, but they had to be re-nominated in accordance with the letter. The first nomination for the post of Secretary-General following the joint letter was received on 18 December 2015. At time of writing, 11 candidates had been nominated, all by their respective governments. As stipulated in the joint letter, member states wrote to both the president of the Council and the president of the General Assembly formally nominating their candidate and providing some background and biographical information. The two presidents then jointly circulated to member states the details of the nominated candidates on an ongoing basis.

Eastern Europe maintains that according

to the practice of regional rotation, it is next in line for the position of Secretary-General; the Chair of the Group of Eastern European States wrote to UN member states in November 2014 formally expressing this and recalling that Eastern Europe is the only regional group that has not had a Secretary-General. While eight of the 11 candidates nominated by the time of writing are from Eastern Europe, candidates from New Zealand and Portugal (both Western European and Others Group) and from Argentina (Group of Latin American and Caribbean States [GRULAC]) have entered the race. The strong advocacy by some groups for a first woman Secretary-General appears to have succeeded in encouraging the nomination of a larger number of women: so far, five of the 11 candidates are women. In 15 elections held over the last 70 years for the post of UN Secretary-General, only three women have been seriously considered as candidates (Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit (India) in 1953, Gro Harlem Brundtland (Norway) in 1991 and Vaira Vike-Freiberga (Latvia) in 2006).

The eleven nominees (as at 30 June) are:

- **Irina Bokova** (Bulgaria), Director-General of UNESCO and former Minister of Foreign Affairs a.i.; nominated on 9 February 2016.
- **Helen Clark** (New Zealand), Administrator of UNDP and former Prime Minister; nominated on 4 April 2016.
- **Natalia Gherman** (Moldova), former First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and European Integration; nominated on 18 February 2016.
- **António Guterres** (Portugal), former UN High Commissioner for Refugees and former Prime Minister; nominated on 29 February 2016.
- **Vuk Jeremić** (Serbia), former Foreign Minister and former President of the 67th session of the General Assembly; nominated on 12 April 2016.
- **Srgjan Kerim** (former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), former Minister of Foreign Affairs and former President of the 62nd session of the General Assembly; nominated on 18 December 2015.
- **Miroslav Lajčák** (Slovakia), Minister of Foreign and European Affairs and former High Representative in Bosnia and

Herzegovina; nominated on 25 May 2016.

- **Igor Lukšić** (Montenegro), Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and former Prime Minister; nominated on 14 January 2016.
- **Susana Malcorra** (Argentina), Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship, former Chef de Cabinet to the UN Secretary-General; nominated on 18 May 2016.
- **Vesna Pusić** (Croatia), former First Deputy Prime Minister and former Minister of Foreign and European Affairs; nominated on 5 January 2016.
- **Danilo Türk** (Slovenia), former President of Slovenia and former UN Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs; nominated on 3 February 2016.

The president of the General Assembly invited each candidate to submit a concise vision statement on the challenges and opportunities facing the next Secretary-General, and these were uploaded onto the website created by the Office of the President of the General Assembly for the selection process. The vision statements and the website have become key tools for greater transparency in the selection process.

Interaction between the President of the Security Council and the President of the General Assembly

The changes in the early stages of the selection process have led to unprecedented joint activity between the Council and the General Assembly. General Assembly president Lykketoft has made it a point to interact with the president of the Council regularly at the start of every month and has used these meetings to have a discussion on the selection and appointment process. Members of the General Assembly have been kept informed of the monthly meetings through letters from the president of the General Assembly. Between October and December 2015, these meetings were used by the president of the General Assembly to press for the joint letter to go out by the end of the year. The meetings early this year provided the president of the General Assembly with the opportunity to share with the Council president his thoughts regarding the format and modalities of the informal dialogues and provide information about his planned “timeline”.

Part II: General Assembly Activities

Informal Dialogues with Candidates

The most innovative feature of this selection process so far has been the informal dialogues with candidates organised by the president of the General Assembly. These meetings are in accordance with resolution 69/321, which required that the General Assembly conduct informal dialogues or meetings with candidates running for the position of Secretary-General.

In 2006, several of the candidates participated in meetings of regional groups of the General Assembly, or cross-regional meetings such as the Forum of Small States. However, 2016 is the first time that candidates have been questioned in public by the full UN membership, with some civil society participation.

The first round of informal dialogues—now generally referred to as “hearings” although this language had been avoided in the drafting of resolution 69/321—was held from 12 to 14 April, with the nine candidates who had been nominated up to that date. A second round was held on 7 June for the two candidates who had entered the race after the April hearings. Each candidate was given a two-hour time slot, starting with a ten-minute presentation, after which they took questions from representatives of member states and regional groups, reflecting their current concerns and expectations of the next Secretary-General. Most Council members participated actively in the hearings. Each candidate also answered two to three questions from civil society actors. The UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS) solicited questions from civil society, and more than 1500 questions were submitted from over 70 countries online from February through March 2016 from around the world. A volunteer “Civil Society Committee” worked with NGLS and the Office of the President to select 28 questions, which were presented through a video during the hearings. The candidates have been given the opportunity to answer a selection of the top ten questions on the president of the General Assembly’s website. The hearings were webcast, and remain accessible on-line. Candidates were also given an opportunity to do a media stakeout following their session. These hearings were a public platform for the candidates to present their visions and ideas for a better organisation to the UN membership, as well as to a global audience. Separately, civil society groups and organisations have organised discussions with the candidates, providing a further opportunity for

them to elaborate on their vision for the UN. In addition, for the first time the process is being closely followed on social media, which is being used by some of the candidates.

Since at least one additional candidate is expected to be nominated in early July, the president of the General Assembly is expected to organise another informal dialogue session in mid-July. The president of the General Assembly invited candidates to attend high-level debates on the Sustainable Development Goals in April and peace and security in May, and has also invited them to the forthcoming high-level debate on human rights on 12-13 July. He is planning to invite the candidates to a “Global Townhall” event at that time.

The informal dialogues with the candidates have introduced an element of transparency in a process that has been highly secretive in the past when even awareness of who were being considered was limited. Member states have warmly welcomed the opportunity to hear from the candidates, and overall feedback on this innovation has been very positive. In his closing remarks following the second round on 7 June, the president of the General Assembly noted that the hearings had provided an insight into what the membership is looking for in the next Secretary-General, including a “strong, independent and courageous Secretary-General who will make full use of the powers provided for in the UN Charter”. He also highlighted that the next Secretary-General is expected to have the skills to transform the UN in order to respond to today’s peace and security challenges; implement the 2030 Agenda and Paris Climate Agreement; ensure greater respect for human rights; and focus on the world’s most vulnerable countries and peoples. He pointed out that members would welcome the first-ever woman Secretary-General but that they also wanted a person committed to gender equality.

Some members, including the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) group, have suggested that there might be a straw poll of the General Assembly, in order to assess how member states rank the candidates who have participated in the hearings, perhaps at an informal meeting convened by the president of the General Assembly. However, the president of the General Assembly has indicated that resolution 69/321 gives him no mandate to do this.

Other Activities in the General Assembly

Discussion on the next draft resolution on the revitalisation of the work of the General Assembly, which is expected to be adopted in September 2016, began on 23 May. Following on from the landmark resolution last year, this year’s initial draft from the co-chairs refers to the developments in the Secretary-General selection process including the joint letter and circulation of names of candidates and welcomes the organisation and convening of the informal dialogues.

The draft resolution again stresses the need for fair and equitable distribution based on gender and geographical balance in the appointment of executive heads of the organisation, and in this context welcomes the presentation of a significant number of women as candidates for the post of Secretary-General. An issue that may require some negotiation is how to address the gender and geographical imbalance at the level of Under-Secretaries and Assistant-Secretaries-General, including the Senior Management Group of the UN Secretariat. There are also likely to be difficult negotiations over language the NAM group would like to include to require the Council to recommend multiple candidates for appointment as Secretary-General to the General Assembly. The duration and renewability of the term of the Secretary-General may also be contentious.

The Accountability, Coherence and Transparency group (ACT), a cross-regional group of 25 small and mid-sized countries working to improve the accountability, coherence and transparency of the Security Council, has been active on several issues related to the process of selecting and appointing the next Secretary-General. In June 2015, it presented proposals for a joint letter by the presidents of the General Assembly and Council inviting members to initiate the process, formal presentation of the candidates in the General Assembly as well as Council hearings, a timeline for the selection process, gender balance and fair and equitable geographic distribution. Many of ACT’s proposals were reflected in resolution 69/321. While reiterating some of its concerns in a February 2016 position paper on outstanding issues, ACT highlighted the prerogative of the General Assembly to draft its resolution for the appointment of the Secretary-General, and to make this a more substantive resolution, including regarding the term

Part II: General Assembly Activities (con't)

of office of the Secretary-General. ACT followed this up with a letter on 18 May to the president of the General Assembly, suggesting that he initiate a facilitation process

for the appointment resolution. At time of writing, it was unclear whether this would be possible, as the president of the General Assembly's mandate to appoint facilitators

generally comes from a resolution making such a request or when support from a large number of members for such an initiative has been clearly manifested.

Part III: Security Council Activities

Meetings Among Council Members

Council discussions on this issue have so far been either in very informal meetings, such as the monthly breakfasts to consider the Council's programme of work, or under "any other business". One of the first occasions where the issue was publicly aired was during the wrap-up session on the Council's work at the end of June 2015, when Malaysia included the selection of the next Secretary-General as a suggested topic in its concept note for the wrap-up session.

Council members had their first opportunity for a fuller exchange of views on this issue on 22 July, during a discussion under "any other business" initiated by the New Zealand presidency. On 18 October, during Spain's presidency, the Council held a debate on working methods during which the selection process for the next Secretary-General was raised by a number of members. General Assembly president Lykketoft was among the briefers, focusing on the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly. Lykketoft highlighted the then recently adopted resolution 69/321 and his discussions with the president of the Council regarding the joint letter inviting member states to nominate candidates. During the debate, transparency of the process and the importance of having women candidates were stressed by several speakers. The "any other business" format was used again on 19 November during the UK's presidency to discuss the joint letter on the selection process from the two presidents.

There was a lull in the Council's focus on this issue following agreement on the joint letter in mid-December 2015. In February 2016, Malaysia brought together the elected members at political coordinator level, to gauge if there were common positions on the timing of the start of the selection process and the use of straw polls. Most members seemed to regard July as the preferred start date and to agree that straw polls were a useful tool for discerning Council members' openness to particular candidates. Other options, such as a single term

for the Secretary-General and multiple candidates being recommended to the General Assembly, were seen as less likely to get Council agreement. Also in February, the outgoing head of the Security Council Affairs Division briefed Council members on past practice in the selection of the Secretary-General.

Following the first hearings in the General Assembly in mid-April, Council members appear to have been galvanised into considering next steps for the Council. A series of informal meetings took place among the ten elected members, as well as meetings among smaller groups of Council members who had taken a particular interest in this issue or had upcoming presidencies. In addition, it seems that there may have been at least one meeting among the P5.

At the start of May, Council permanent representatives agreed at the monthly breakfast on the programme of work that the political coordinators would discuss the way forward for the Council. Egypt, president of the Council for May, and Spain produced a paper on informal guidelines for the process in the Council, which was discussed at the political coordinator level on 18 May. The paper focused on a number of key issues, including possible meetings of the Council with candidates, when the initial round of straw polls should take place, and communication with the wider UN membership. It seems that a smaller group of members had discussed several other issues, including whether a shortlist of candidates should be created and the modalities for meetings with candidates. However, in view of clear divisions on some of these issues, it was decided that it might be best to focus on potential agreement on immediate next steps.

Council members thus turned to written guidelines from past years. While an unwritten understanding had developed over the years with regard to the selection process, the first written guidelines were drafted in 1996. As the Council approached the start of consultations on the appointment of the next Secretary-General that year, Ambassador Nugroho

Wisnumurti (Indonesia), during his term as president of the Council in November 1996, submitted a set of guidelines to facilitate the process. The "Wisnumurti Guidelines", as they became known, were agreed on at a Council lunch on 12 November 1996 but were not issued as an official document. However, in December 1996, after the decision had been made to appoint Kofi Annan, the permanent representative of Italy, who was president for the month, circulated a limited number of copies of the guidelines. The Wisnumurti Guidelines set out general principles, the legal/procedural basis and the decision-making process, including the use of colour-coded straw polls. They also specified that candidates needed to be submitted by member states, and that this could be done either formally or informally. In February 2006, the Secretariat circulated a fact sheet which reflected the 1996 guidelines. It seems that the UK has expressed interest in revising the Wisnumurti Guidelines to take account of innovations introduced this year.

On 27 May, Egypt, as Council president, initiated a discussion on the Council's next steps in the selection process under "any other business". Among areas covered were how to communicate to the General Assembly the start of the selection process in the Council; scheduling of straw polls; and meetings with candidates. While no decision was made on the first two issues, members agreed to meet informally with candidates who requested a meeting with the Council, after several such requests had been received. There was some concern that Council meetings with candidates might replicate the General Assembly hearings rather than provide further insights into how a candidate would perform as Secretary-General. By early 2016, Council members had therefore begun to move away from the possible use of the Arria-formula meeting format suggested by the UK, towards a more confidential, informal format that could allow for a frank exchange of views, and complement, rather than duplicate the General Assembly process. The first Council interaction was with

Part III: Security Council Activities (con't)

Danilo Turk on 7 June, when members posed questions to him during a one-hour breakfast meeting. This was followed by meetings with Irina Bokova on 20 June and Vuk Jeremic on 27 June using the same format. Several other candidates are expected to meet with the Council before the straw polls.

In late May, Russia circulated a paper on the procedure for straw polls, outlining its views on how they should be conducted. In early June, soon after it took on the Council presidency, France circulated a more comprehensive paper on the 2016 process, which included an annex on the practice related to straw polls. (In July 2006, during its presidency of the Council, France had circulated a paper on the procedure for straw polls as the Council

began considering Secretary-General candidates.) France's 2016 paper described the main elements of the procedure followed in the Council during previous selections and highlighted some of the key questions the Council needed to address now in moving forward.

On 7 June, an informal meeting, mainly at the permanent representative level, was held to discuss the French paper. Among matters covered were the starting date of straw polls and modalities for conducting them. Members remained divided between those who favoured starting as soon as possible now that the second round of hearings had taken place and those proposing starting only in late July. Members in favour of an earlier date argued that starting in late July could result in little

preparation time for the new Secretary-General, while those in favour of the later timing noted that candidates were expecting the straw polls to start in late July and had arranged their campaign activities around that date. The use of colour-coded ballots was also discussed, with at least one elected member arguing strongly for not using them at all. There appeared to be some consensus that colour-coded ballots should not be used until late in the selection process. By mid-June, Council members had come to an agreement on the date of the first straw poll, and the president of the Council sent the president of the General Assembly a letter informing him that the Council would start the process of consideration of the candidates on 21 July.

Part IV: Formal Ballots and Straw Polls

How Candidates are Selected

In 1946, the General Assembly adopted resolution 11(I), which determined the first selection process for both the Council and the General Assembly. The resolution required voting majorities in both the Council and the General Assembly and provided that both recommendation and appointment be discussed in private meetings and that a vote, if taken, should be in secret. As a result, the Council's voting process for the recommendation of the UN Secretary-General has been shrouded in secrecy for the past 70 years.

In this section, we attempt to answer some of the key questions surrounding the straw polls and formal balloting process.

How have candidates been nominated in the past?

This year's process of open nominations, accompanied by vision statements and curricula vitae of candidates, and public informal dialogues, is a far cry from the secretive process of previous years. Starting with the very first Secretary-General, the early years are characterised by the domination of the permanent members in proposing possible candidates. The first three Secretaries-General—Trygve Lie (Norway), Dag Hammarskjöld (Sweden) and U Thant (Burma)—emerged from an ad hoc process where candidates were suggested by P5 members, with the US and USSR putting forward most of the candidates during informal discussions. In

the selection of the first Secretary-General, the UK and the US favoured Lester Pearson (Canada), while the USSR wanted an Eastern European candidate. Trygve Lie was a compromise candidate suggested by the USSR, with a geographic and political background that both the US and USSR could live with.

While the process remained very much in the control of the permanent members, by the 1971 election to choose U Thant's successor there was some discreet lobbying for the position, as candidates were beginning to be quietly suggested by their governments. In these early years, the P5 held informal consultations to ascertain which candidates might be acceptable to them before coming up with a list that would then be put to a vote in a private meeting of the Council. At this point, elected members could possibly add candidates that they might wish to have on the list. Very little information was given out about the P5 discussions. For example, in 1971, the P5 agreed among themselves that they would tell the press that consultations were ongoing but reveal nothing about frequency or place of meetings. Elected members tended to accept without questioning the right of the P5 to propose candidates and even suggested when there was a deadlock that the P5 meet separately to come up with a candidate that all five could agree on. In the event of a deadlock, new names were suggested until candidates were found who would be acceptable to all the P5.

Until 1991, there was no strong push for

regional rotation, and candidates were generally formally nominated by member states on the Council, rather than their own governments.

What have been the factors influencing P5 voting?

The politics of the Cold War was a central factor in decisions on the appointment of a Secretary-General until the 1990s. Positions taken by the P5 were strongly influenced by Cold War relationships, as well as current political events. For example, in 1951, the USSR vetoed Lie's second term because he had been an active supporter of the US-led intervention to aid South Korea in the Korean War, and the US made it clear that it would veto any candidate proposed by Russia. Finding a suitable candidate during this period was not easy. The US and its allies did not want a national of any state within the Soviet bloc in the position, while the USSR was suspicious of most nationals from the West. There were a limited number of acceptable countries from which the Secretary-General could come.

China (which had been represented by the Republic of China [Taiwan] until 25 October 1971) tended in the 1970s and 1980s to favour candidates from Third World countries. Its desire to be seen as responsive to the developing world was seen in its position on Kurt Waldheim, the fourth Secretary-General. At the time of his election in 1971, the developing countries in the UN were lobbying for a candidate from the Third World. During this period,

Part IV: Formal Ballots and Straw Polls (con't)

the newly independent developing nations had become the dominant voting bloc in the General Assembly, while Western enthusiasm for the UN had diminished. Other permanent members were not immune to the views of the larger membership. Some Arab members in 1971 conducted an active campaign against Max Jakobson (Finland) because of his Jewish heritage, and this may have been a factor in the USSR's use of its veto against him.

The process has not always been smooth in the post-Cold War period. Permanent members have reacted to vetoes against a candidate they support by vetoing the candidate of another permanent member, as happened in 1996 when France repeatedly vetoed Kofi Annan (Ghana) after the US had vetoed the candidate it supported, Boutros Boutros-Ghali (Egypt).

How significant is the use of the veto in formal and informal voting on candidates?

The use of the veto has been a key factor in the choice of almost every Secretary-General. However, the opaque nature of the selection process makes it difficult to determine the exact number of vetoes cast, and by which permanent member(s). The vote in the selection of the UN Secretary-General is one of the rare times when formal ballots in the Council are cast in secret. There is a separate ballot paper for each candidate with his or her name and three options: yes, no or abstain. The ballot papers are marked as those of either permanent or non-permanent members, which allows for vetoes to be noted but cast anonymously. While not considered formal vetoes, negative votes cast by permanent members during straw polls have at times had the same effect as the veto and have exercised a significant influence on the process. Past Secretaries-General have often been selected only after early favourites had been vetoed. At times, like-minded permanent members have colluded in using vetoes to exclude a candidate they wanted to reject. Over the years, candidates who had the support of the majority of Council members have been eliminated through the negative vote of a permanent member. By giving permanent members the decisive vote, the veto has ensured that only candidates that are acceptable to all five are likely to be recommended for the position.

Do elected members have a role to play, given the dominance of the permanent members in this process?

It has been possible for elected members to

sway a permanent member through majority opinion, as was seen in the appointment of a new Secretary-General in 1996. During the straw ballot voting, Kofi Annan received a coloured ballot in seven rounds, indicating opposition from a permanent member. However, as the positive votes for Annan moved up to 14, France, which had opposed Annan's candidacy, changed its vote in the face of support from all other members, and reportedly after Annan promised to appoint a French national to head the Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

Elected members also play a key role in eliminating candidates who are deemed less suitable for the position. Although a formal cut-off score has not been used in straw polls, poor overall support is a strong signal that can persuade candidates to withdraw their names, or lead on to elimination in later straw polls. In addition, the number of votes from elected members could be a significant factor in the formal ballot if there is more than one candidate and no veto.

Have there been instances where a Council member has recused itself from a vote because it had a national as a candidate for Secretary-General?

The New Zealand government, on 4 April, nominated Helen Clark for the position of Secretary-General. As New Zealand is currently an elected member of the Council, this has given rise to questions about whether there is a need for New Zealand to recuse itself from aspects of the selection process. In particular, the fact that New Zealand will be president of the Council in September when straw polls are expected to still be ongoing, has raised questions about the role of the presidency when it has a candidate in the fray. However, there is nothing in the Charter that indicates that a member of the Council cannot participate in the selection process involving a national candidate it has nominated.

There have been at least five cases in the past where a country was on the Council when it had a candidate being considered for Secretary-General. The best known example is that of Boutros-Ghali's unsuccessful re-election bid in 1996 when Egypt was a member of the Council. It is clear from the fact that Boutros-Ghali had 14 positive votes against one veto, which is known to have come from the US, that Egypt took part in the process. In 1950, when Trygve Lie was being considered for a second term, nine members, including

Norway, voted for him, with the USSR voting against, and China abstaining. In 1957, Sweden was on the Council when the incumbent Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, was recommended by the Council for a second term. A more complicated situation arose in 1971 when Carlos Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina) was among the candidates voted on in the second ballot. He was the permanent representative of Argentina, which was an elected member at the time. While records indicate that all 15 members of the Council voted, it is unclear how having a permanent representative of a country on the Council as a candidate was handled. Lastly, in 1991, when Bernard Chidzero (Zimbabwe) was Boutros-Ghali's main competitor, Zimbabwe was an elected member of the Council.

As it seems likely that the selection process will still be underway when New Zealand takes on the Council presidency in September, there may be questions about whether it should recuse itself from any of the activities related to the selection process at this point.

Rule 20 of the Council's Provisional Rules of Procedure provides that:

Whenever the President of the Security Council deems that for the proper fulfillment of the responsibilities of the presidency he should not preside over the Council during the consideration of a particular question with which the member he represents is directly connected, he shall indicate his decision to the Council.

It appears that it is up to New Zealand to decide whether it is comfortable presiding over straw polls or formal ballots if these take place during its presidency and involve its candidate.

How have regional groups affected the process?

While Article 97 of the UN Charter provides no guidance on rotation of the post of Secretary-General, there was a growing sense by 1971 that after two European Secretaries-General, U Thant's successor should come from another region in the developing world. However, specific regional groups were not putting pressure on the Council to choose a candidate from their region, with both Latin American and African candidates being given support. Nonetheless it was a European, Kurt Waldheim, who was appointed that year. There is some evidence that Latin American delegations invoked a principle of rotation in 1981, but there was no concerted campaign from GRULAC, with only five of the

Part IV: Formal Ballots and Straw Polls (con't)

nine candidates who emerged following the deadlock between Kurt Waldheim and Salim Ahmed Salim (Tanzania) coming from Latin America, before the eventual selection of Javier Pérez de Cuéllar (Peru). The 1991 election was the first where a region—Africa—made a strong claim that it was its turn for the position. The Organisation of African Unity at its summit in May 1991 endorsed a slate of six candidates, and although candidates from other regions were also proposed, African candidates dominated the straw polls as well as the formal vote. In the 2006 selection process that resulted in the appointment of Ban Ki-moon (Republic of Korea), the Asian region made a strong bid for a candidate from their region. Vaira Vike-Freiberga, the President of Latvia, who was nominated jointly by three countries—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—was the only candidate not from the Asian Group that year.

What are straw polls, how are they conducted and have they changed over the years?

The practice of using straw polls has developed in order to assess viability among multiple candidates before formal balloting. The straw ballot process means that votes can be cast informally without holding an official meeting in the Council chamber and casting formal votes. One consequence of this is that the number of recorded meetings devoted to the selection process, and therefore its transparency, has significantly diminished over the years. While vetoes are still being used, they are far more hidden than when a formal ballot is used, as there is no official information on the straw polls.

History of the Straw Polling System

Until 1981, in order to get agreement on the recommendation of a candidate to the General Assembly, the Council would have a series of formal ballots in private meetings in line with Rule 48 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure, which states that the Council's recommendation to the General Assembly "be discussed and decided at a private meeting". Under Rule 55, the Secretary-General must issue a communiqué summarising the outcome even for a "closed meeting". Some of the communiqués provide information on how many votes were cast, name the candidates and indicate whether a resolution had not been adopted due to a veto. This was the case with the series of votes taken in March 1953 to choose Lie's successor. More commonly in later practice, only minimal information on a vote was provided.

A system of using straw polls came about as a result of the deadlock in 1981 between Kurt

Waldheim (Austria), who after serving two terms as Secretary-General had chosen to run for an unprecedented third term, and Salim Ahmed Salim (Tanzania), who had been endorsed by the OAU. It is generally known that in 1971 China vetoed Waldheim twice, before abstaining during the third formal vote which led to Waldheim being appointed Secretary-General. China also vetoed Waldheim in the first round of votes for his reelection in 1976 but moved to abstention in the second ballot. In 1981, China used its veto to block Waldheim, supporting Salim, who was being blocked by Western veto, leading to 16 inconclusive ballots. Finally, Ambassador Olara Otunnu (Uganda), who was Council president in December 1981, persuaded the two candidates to step aside and devised a way to determine which new candidates would not be vetoed by any of the P5. The permanent members were given a blue survey form with a list of nine new candidates and asked to indicate which ones they would "discourage". All 15 members were given a white form with the list of names and asked to indicate which candidates they would "encourage". Using this system, the Council identified Javier Pérez de Cuéllar (Peru) as generally acceptable, and he went forward to be elected Secretary-General in a formal vote on 11 December.

This informal survey of members' opinion developed into a system of "straw polls" that has been used in every subsequent election ahead of a formal ballot.

The 1991 election used colour-coded ballot papers to differentiate between permanent and elected members in the same straw poll. In this way, the preferences of the permanent members as well as potential vetoes were revealed ahead of a formal vote. Colour-coded ballot sheets had been used in formal secret ballots in the past but this appears to have been the first time such a system was introduced in the context of an informal vote.

Another development in 1991 was that for the first time, a regional claim was made on the position: by Africa, with the Organisation of African Unity endorsing six candidates. In the first straw poll held on 21 October, all 15 members were given a list of names and asked to indicate with an "x" those they wished to support. A blank ballot paper allowed members to add new candidates. At the second straw poll, names newly suggested in the initial poll were voted on first, followed by individual ballots for each of the candidates on the combined list of names, which included several non-African candidates. Boutros Boutros-Ghali (Egypt) and Bernard Chidzero (Zimbabwe) emerged as the leading candidates. In order to determine if there would be a veto, in the fourth round permanent members were given a red ballot sheet and elected members a white one. Having established that neither of the leading candidates was opposed by any of the P5, the Council proceeded to vote formally on each of the two candidates, with Boutros-Ghali emerging as the victor.

Five years later, following two straw polls in

which he was the only candidate, Boutros-Ghali was formally vetoed by the US. This led to four new African candidates entering the race. In the first round of straw polling held on 10 December 1996, Kofi Annan (Ghana), then Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping, and Amara Essy (Côte d'Ivoire) each received a high number of favourable votes. A second round, held on the same day, where colour-coded ballots were used, revealed that a permanent member, generally believed to be France, was opposing Kofi Annan, and two other permanent members opposed Essy. The veto against Annan was sustained until on 13 December—after seven rounds of straw polls—Annan had the support of all 14 other members, and the veto was then dropped.

Straw polls were used again in 2006, but this time with the addition of an abstention or "no opinion" option. Ban Ki-moon (Republic of Korea) was selected after four straw polls, with colour-coded ballots used in the last of these. Although Ban had received one "discourage" vote in the first three straw polls, in the fourth, which used colour-coded ballots, he received 14 "encourage" votes and one "no opinion" from an elected member.

How has the recommendation to the General Assembly been made and acted upon?

The final step in the selection process for the Council is a recommendation on the appointment of the next Secretary-General to the General Assembly, which has been made through the adoption of a resolution. This Council resolution has not always been adopted unanimously, but as this matter is deemed to be a substantive one, it cannot be adopted with a permanent member voting against. The resolutions recommending the last two Secretaries-General, Kofi Annan and Ban Ki-moon, were adopted by acclamation after consensus had been reached following multiple straw polls.

The actual appointment has traditionally been made by way of a General Assembly resolution, for example resolution 61/3 of 13 October 2006 appointing Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to his first term of office.

Since the re-appointment of Kurt Waldheim in 1976, the Security Council has included the term of office in its resolution recommending a candidate for appointment, and the General Assembly has invariably reflected the same language in its resolution appointing the Council's recommended candidate. However, it seems clear from General Assembly resolution 11(I) of 1946 that the General Assembly could choose to define the term of office differently in its resolution.

Part V: Issues and Options

As the Council moves towards the start of straw polls, there are a number of outstanding issues that need to be agreed on. Among the issues are:

- [Timing of the start of the straw polls:](#)

The joint letter stated that the straw polls would begin by the end of July, and in mid-June, the Council agreed to hold the first straw poll on 21 July. Some members believe starting at this point may not guarantee enough time between the eventual appointment of the new Secretary-General and the beginning of his or her term of office on 1 January 2017. The Council's busy schedule in July could limit further straw polls that month. There appears to be a reluctance to schedule straw polls in August, as this is a month when several of the permanent representatives are on holiday. This could result in the bulk of straw polling being undertaken only in September, giving rise to the possibility that a candidate may not be selected until an uncertain date in October or even November.

- [The use of colour-coded ballots:](#) There appears to be growing support for the view that colour-coded ballots should only be used late in the process, possibly as a last resort to determine if a veto is likely. This is how they were used in 1991 and 2006. There was only one occasion—in 1996—when Council members moved to colour-coded ballots after the first round and on the same day. One option for the Council is to consider not using colour-coded ballots at all in order to exclude the influence of a veto from a permanent member during the straw poll process.

- [Communicating the results of the straw polls to candidates:](#) One of the key issues is how to handle the results of the straw polls in a discreet and sensitive way. Members need to agree what information candidates will be given following a round of straw polling. In 2006, the Council agreed that the president of the Council would communicate to the candidates and the permanent representatives of nominating states the number of ballots of “encouraged”, “discouraged” or “no opinion expressed” received by

candidates, together with the highest and lowest scores among the candidates, without identifying the candidates who received these. Members are aware that—particularly with the changes in technology since the 2006 election—results need to be communicated promptly in order to ensure that they do not reach the public before the candidates have been informed.

- [Creating a shortlist of candidates:](#) It seems that the largest number of candidates voted on in the past may have been 14. This year there are already close to that number, and it may even be exceeded, so members are thinking about how to narrow the field of candidates. Using the system of one ballot paper per candidate, with the 11 currently nominated candidates there would be 165 ballots in total. In the past, when candidates were privately given their own and the highest and lowest scores, it was hoped that by giving some indication of their chances of success, a candidate with a large number of negative votes or discouragements might quietly withdraw. However, as seen in the 2006 election, even with low scores, candidates may choose to remain until late in the process. That year, only one candidate withdrew before the fourth straw poll, which was the one where ballots were differentiated. The other candidates withdrew only following the fourth ballot when it became clear that only Ban Ki-moon did not have a “discourage” vote from a permanent member. One option would be for Council members to agree on a cut-off score below which candidates would not go forward into the next straw poll.

- [Handling the entry of late candidates:](#) In some past years, last-minute candidates were suggested, mainly by the P5, and immediately put to a vote. There was resistance from some permanent members during the negotiations on the joint letter to set a deadline for nominations, and the possibility of last-minute nominations was left open. If a late entry candidate does not go through the General Assembly hearings, this may create a sense of a two-tier system, in which candidates have not been

treated equally. The current president of the General Assembly, Mogens Lyketoft has regularly called on member states who intend to present candidates to do so expeditiously and has pledged to organise informal dialogues for additional candidates. The General Assembly president-elect Ambassador Peter Thomson (Fiji), who will take over the position in September, stated during the hearings for candidates for the president of the General Assembly organised by the World Federation of UN Associations that late candidates should go through the same procedures as the others.

- [Updating the UN membership:](#) Once the Council moves into the straw polls, it will have to decide how to keep the wider membership informed. In the past, this has been done by the Council president orally informing the president of the General Assembly that a straw poll has taken place. Ahead of the first straw poll, Council members need to decide whether to use the same format and how much information to convey. Alternatively, the Council could choose a more formal approach by sending a letter to the president of the General Assembly stating that the straw polls took place and — if there is an openness to providing more information— which candidates will go on to the next straw poll and when it will take place.

- [Multiple candidates and single term:](#) These issues have continued to be part of the larger discussion on the selection process and will be part of the negotiations on the resolution on the revitalisation of the work of the General Assembly. They may feature in discussions of the General Assembly resolution to appoint the person recommended by the Council. It is most unlikely that the Council will propose any changes to the practices of recommending a single candidate or of two five-year terms. While ACT has suggested a more substantive appointment resolution, which could include a decision on the term, at the time of writing, this idea had not been taken up more generally by the wider UN membership.

Part VI: Council Dynamics

As highlighted earlier in this report, the selection process has traditionally been dominated by the permanent members. In the early days, they had almost total control over the list of candidates, and the elected members accepted that this was an area where they had little say. Permanent members are fully aware that their veto power over the recommendation of the candidate for Secretary-General gives them a distinct advantage. As a result, some believe that although the permanent members have accepted—sometimes reluctantly—the changes in the 2016 process in its early stages, once the Council moves into the phases of straw polls and voting, it will be business as usual, with the final outcome very much dependent on finding a candidate who will not be subject to a veto from one or other member of the P5.

The P5 have shown divisions on timing, with China and Russia arguing strongly for keeping very much to the same timetable as in 2006. With the first straw polls now confirmed for 21 July, it seems that an early recommendation is unlikely. The UK and France have expressed openness to a more transparent process, but at the same time are keen to maintain secrecy once it comes to the straw polls and voting. China has been relatively reticent up to this point, but it has shown in the past that it can take very strong positions on candidates. The US too has generally not expressed very strong views during the discussions on next steps and procedure of the straw polls but is likely to become more assertive once the straw polls begin.

There also appear to be tensions between permanent members over who is the lead on this issue. The UK positioned itself as the lead on this issue when it took on the drafting

and negotiations of the joint letter around its November presidency, between October and December 2015. It has also held meetings with selected members—largely those that are expected to take on the presidency in the next few months—in order to brainstorm next steps for the Council. Russia, whose permanent representative was involved in and thus has personal knowledge of the procedure used in the 2006 selection process through which current Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon emerged, has conveyed this to members of the Council both orally and by producing a paper on the procedure for the straw polls. Russia will be the president of the Council in October when the final straw polls and formal vote are likely to take place. France had initially remained in the background, but in June—almost as soon as it took on the Council presidency—it circulated a paper on the procedure for the selection, which was used as the basis for discussion on the next steps for the Council.

The elected members have taken an active interest in the selection process, partly because, except for June (France) and October (Russia), elected members will be president of the Council in the months when the most activity is expected on this issue. Japan, which was president of the Council in October 2006 when Ban Ki-moon was recommended, has been very conscious since it began its term in January 2016, that it will take on the presidency in July, the month seen since the joint letter as the most likely for the start of the straw polls. As a result, Japan has been particularly keen to have the procedure of the straw polls agreed on before the start of its presidency. The elected members that

were likely to have the presidency during the period of possible consideration of the issue such as Egypt, Malaysia, New Zealand and Spain have all invested time and energy in trying to get the process going and ensuring that the elected members have some say in shaping the process. Malaysia initiated the first meeting of E10 members at the political coordinator level to discuss this issue, while Egypt and Spain circulated the paper which led to an “any other business” discussion on the next steps for the Council on 27 May. New Zealand might perhaps have played a more active role on this issue if it did not have a national candidate being considered for the position.

The elected members have also asserted themselves in terms of how the straw polls are to be conducted. While open to using this method to assess informally the Council’s receptiveness towards candidates, a number of E10 members expressed reservations about the use of coloured ballot papers in straw polls, with opinion divided over when they should be used or even if they should be used at all. Spain has argued strongly that the colour-coded ballots should not be used at all, but it is unclear whether there will be enough support for this to persuade the permanent members to give up what is in effect their use of the veto in the informal votes. In advance of the first straw poll on 21 July, the E10 have begun discussing their role during the straw polls. Up to this point, other than Egypt, the African members have not been particularly assertive on selection issues. Ukraine, Uruguay and Venezuela have expressed views on some issues but have not been very active in the discussions on the procedure and next steps.

Conclusion

This year’s appointment process has been unprecedented in terms of increased transparency and inclusiveness in the General Assembly. As the Council begins its consideration of candidates, one question that is being asked is whether this openness will significantly influence the process in the Security Council.

The General Assembly hearings have for the first time provided a basis on which the wider membership, as well as a global audience, is able to assess the candidates for this position. The question remains as to whether

the hearings will be a “game-changer” and fundamentally affect the calculations upon which the Council will base its recommendation. The president of the General Assembly has suggested that this will be the case. The process has provided a clearer picture of what the wider membership is looking for in a Secretary-General, possibly making it less likely to accept a candidate who is perceived to fall short of those expectations.

As the history of the Council’s activity on this issue illustrates, ultimately this decision

has been a highly political one based on geopolitical considerations and bilateral relationships. The challenge for the Council is to recommend the right Secretary-General to lead the UN in the face of numerous new global challenges. The need for the Secretary-General to work with the permanent members, as well as the wider membership, is recognised, but should not give rise to compromise on the qualities required. If the Council does not meet that challenge, given the unprecedented changes so far, General

Conclusion (con't)

Assembly president Lykketoft has suggested that it “should not expect the traditional rubber stamping of their recommendation by the General Assembly.” As it enters this crucial phase in the selection process, the Council has the opportunity to play its part in a process which will communicate a positive view of the UN and its leadership to a global audience.

UN Documents and Useful Additional Resources

Security Council Recommendations and Resolutions

[S/RES/1987](#) (17 June 2011) recommended the reappointment of Ban Ki-moon.

[S/RES/1715](#) (9 October 2006) recommended the appointment of Ban Ki-moon.

[S/RES/1358](#) (27 June 2001) recommended the reappointment of Kofi Annan.

[S/RES/1091](#) (13 December 1996) acknowledged Boutros Boutros-Ghali's contributions.

[S/RES/1090](#) (13 December 1996) recommended the appointment of Kofi Annan.

[S/RES/720](#) (21 November 1991) recommended the appointment of Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

[S/RES/589](#) (10 October 1986) recommended the reappointment of Javier Pérez de Cuéllar.

[S/RES/494](#) (11 December 1981) recommended the appointment of Javier Pérez de Cuéllar.

[S/RES/400](#) (7 December 1976) recommended the reappointment of Kurt Waldheim.

[S/RES/306](#) (21 December 1971) recommended the appointment of Kurt Waldheim.

[S/RES/229](#) (2 December 1966) recommended the reappointment of U Thant.

[S/RES/227](#) (28 October 1966) recommended temporary rollover of the appointment of U Thant.

[Security Council Official Records](#), Seventeenth Year, 1026th Meeting (30 November 1962) recommended the appointment of U Thant.

[S/RES/168](#) (3 November 1961) recommended the appointment of U Thant as acting Secretary-General.

[Letter recommending renewal of appointment of Dag Hammarskjöld](#): Official Records of the Security Council, Twelfth Year, 792nd Meeting (26 September 1957).

[Letter recommending appointment of Dag Hammarskjöld](#): Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year, 617th Meeting (31 March 1953).

[Letter recommending appointment of Trygve Lie](#): Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, First Series, no. 1 page 44 (30 January 1946).

General Assembly Resolutions

[A/RES/69/321](#) (11 September 2015) on the revitalisation of the work of the General Assembly included decisions on the selection of the Secretary-General.

[A/RES/65/282](#) (21 June 2011) renewed the appointment of Ban Ki-moon.

[A/RES/61/3](#) (31 October 2006) appointed Ban Ki-moon.

[A/RES/60/260](#) (8 May 2006) was on management reforms.

[A/RES/60/286](#) (8 September 2006) included decisions on revisions to the process for appointing the Secretary-General.

[A/RES/55/277](#) (6 July 2001) renewed the appointment

of Kofi Annan.

[A/RES/52/12B](#) (19 December 1997) established the post of Deputy Secretary-General.

[A/RES/51/241](#) (31 July 1997) adopted decisions on strengthening the UN system.

[A/RES/51/200](#) (17 December 1996) appointed Kofi Annan.

[A/RES/49/252](#) (23 September 1994) established the Working Group on the Strengthening of the UN System.

[A/RES/46/21](#) (3 December 1991) appointed Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

[A/RES/41/1](#) (10 October 1986) renewed the appointment of Javier Pérez de Cuéllar.

[A/RES/36/137](#) (15 December 1981) appointed Javier Pérez de Cuéllar.

[31/60](#) (8 December 1976) renewed the appointment of Kurt Waldheim.

[2903 \(XXVII\)](#) (22 December 1971) appointed Kurt Waldheim.

[2161 \(XXI\)](#) (2 December 1966) renewed the appointment of U Thant.

[2147 \(XXI\)](#) (1 November 1966) briefly extended the appointment of U Thant.

[1771 \(XVII\)](#) (30 November 1962) appointed U Thant.

[1640 \(XVI\)](#) (3 November 1961) appointed U Thant as Acting Secretary-General.

[1229 \(XII\)](#) (14 December 1957) renewed the appointment of Dag Hammarskjöld.

[709 \(VII\)](#) (7 April 1953) appointed Dag Hammarskjöld.

[492 \(V\)](#) (1 November 1950) extended the appointment of Trygve Lie for three years, without a Security Council recommendation.

[64 \(II\)](#) (1 February 1946) appointed Trygve Lie.

[11 \(I\)](#) (24 January 1946) established terms and process for appointment.

Security Council Meeting Records

[S/PV.7479](#) (30 June 2015) was the record of the wrap-up session of the Council activities in June.

[S/PV.6556](#) (17 June 2011) was the communiqué of the meeting where the Council decided to recommend the appointment of Ban Ki-moon to a second term as Secretary-General.

[S/PV.5547](#) (9 October 2006) was the communiqué of the meeting where the Council recommended the appointment of Ban Ki-moon as Secretary-General.

[S/PV.4337](#) (27 June 2001) was the communiqué of the meeting where the Council recommended the reappointment of Kofi Annan.

[S/PV.3725](#) (13 December 1996) was the communiqué of the meeting where the Council recommended the appointment of Kofi Annan as Secretary-General and adopted a resolution acknowledging Boutros

Boutros-Ghali's contributions.

[S/PV.1026](#) (30 November 1962) was the communiqué of the meeting where the Council recommended the appointment of U Thant.

[S/PV.612](#) (11 March 1953) was the communiqué on the private meeting on the recommendation for the appointment of the Secretary-General which contains the names of several candidates.

[S/PV.613](#) (13 March 1953) was the communiqué of the private meeting on the recommendation of the Secretary-General containing information on candidates and voting, including that there was a negative vote by a permanent member.

[S/PV.614](#) (19 March 1953) was the communiqué of the private meeting where the Soviet Union proposed that the Council should recommend the appointment of V.L. Pandit.

[The 617 meeting of the Security Council](#) (31 March 1953) was the communiqué of the private meeting on the recommendation of the Secretary-General containing the results of the vote which led to Dag Hammarskjöld being appointed Secretary-General.

Secretary-General's Reports

[A/51/950](#) (14 July 1997) was *Renewing the United Nations: a Programme for Reform* proposing the post of Deputy Secretary-General.

[A/51/950/Add.1](#) (7 October 1997) explained the job description for the Deputy Secretary-General.

Other

27 May 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of the Slovak Republic presenting Miroslav Lajčák as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/492](#) (25 May 2016) was from the Prime Minister of the Slovak Republic nominating Miroslav Lajčák for the position of Secretary-General.

23 May 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of the Argentine Republic presenting Susana Malcorra as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/473](#) (18 May 2016) was from the President of the Argentine Republic nominating Susana Malcorra for the position of Secretary-General.

12 April 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of Serbia presenting Vuk Jeremić as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/340](#) (12 April 2016) was from the Prime Minister of Serbia nominating Vuk Jeremić for the position of Secretary-General.

UN Documents (con't)

5 April 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of New Zealand presenting Helen Clark as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/314](#) (4 April 2016) was from the Prime Minister of New Zealand nominating Helen Clark for the position of Secretary-General.

29 February 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of Portugal presenting António Guterres as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/206](#) (29 February 2016) was from the Prime Minister of Portugal nominating António Guterres for the position of Secretary-General.

19 February 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Moldova presenting Natalia Gherman as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/166](#) (18 February 2016) was from the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova nominating Natalia Gherman for the position of Secretary-General.

11 February 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of Bulgaria presenting Irina Bokova as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/139](#) (9 February 2016) was from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bulgaria nominating Irina Bokova for the position of Secretary-General.

9 February 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of Slovenia presenting Danilo Türk as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/128](#) (3 February 2016) was from the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Slovenia nominating Danilo Türk for the position of Secretary-General.

15 January 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of Montenegro presenting Igor Lukšić as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/43](#) (14 January 2016) was from the Permanent Representative of Montenegro nominating Igor Lukšić for the position of Secretary-General.

14 January 2016 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Croatia presenting Vesna Pusić as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2016/40](#) (5 January 2016) was from the Prime Minister of the Republic of Croatia nominating Vesna Pusić for the position of Secretary-General.

[S/2015/1054](#) (18 December 2015) was from the Permanent Representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia nominating Srgjan Kerim for the position of Secretary-General.

30 December 2015 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives to the UN in New York, forwarding a communication from the Permanent Mission of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia presenting Srgjan Kerim as a candidate for the position of Secretary-General.

15 December 2015 joint letter from the Council and General Assembly presidents to all Permanent Representatives and Permanent Observers to the UN in New York, to begin soliciting candidates and to set in motion the process of selecting and appointing the next Secretary-General.

[A/69/PV.103](#) (11 September 2015) was the record of the meeting where resolution [A/RES/59/321](#) was adopted.

[A/69/1007](#) (3 September 2015) was the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly.

27 November 2014 letter from the Chair of the Group of Eastern European States (EEG) expressing the EEG's interest in the next Secretary-General coming from the Group.

[A/65/71](#) (8 April 2010) transmitted the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Selection and conditions of service of Executive Heads in the United Nations system organizations".

6 July 2006 letter from the president of the General Assembly to member states on his meeting with the President of the Security Council.

2 June 2006 letter from the president of the General Assembly to member states attaching letter from the President of the Security Council on the Secretary-General selection process.

[S/2006/252](#) (20 April 2006) was from Malaysia, Chair of the NAM Coordinating Bureau, to the Security Council, communicating NAM's formal position that the next Secretary-General should be from Asia.

[A/50/24](#) (23 July 1996) was the report of the Openended High Level Working Group on the Strengthening of the UN System.

[PC/20](#) (23 December 1945) was the report of the UN Preparatory Commission.

Useful Additional Resources

The Procedure of the UN Security Council, Lorraine Sievers and Sam Daws, Fourth Edition, (Oxford:Oxford University Press, 2014) and its update website www.scprocedure.org

Secretary or General, The UN Secretary-General in World Politics, Simon Chesterman (Ed), (Cambridge University Press), 2007

A Man of Peace in a World of War: Kofi Annan, Stanley Meisler, (John Wiley & Sons, Inc), 2007

Selecting the Next UN Secretary-General, A UNA-USA Report, May 2006, New York

Surrender is Not an Option: Defending America at the United Nations, John Bolton, (Simon and Shuster), 2007

Unvanquished: A U.S. - U.N. Saga, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, (Random House), 1999

A Life in Peace and War, Brian Urquhart, (Harper & Row), 1987

In the Eye of the Storm: The Memoirs of Kurt Waldheim (Weidenfeld and Nicolson), 1985

Hammarskjöld, Brian Urquhart (Alfred A. Knopf), 1972

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969 - 1976, Volume V

Websites

1 for 7 Billion - <http://www.1for7billion.org/>

The Elders - <http://theelders.org/>

Campaign to Elect a Woman Secretary-General - <http://www.womansg.org/>

Group of Friends in Favor of a Woman for Secretary-General

Security Council Report Staff

Ian Martin
Executive Director

Joanna Weschler
Deputy Executive Director &
Director of Research

Amanda Roberts
Coordinating Editor &
Senior Research Analyst

Shamala Kandiah Thompson
What's in Blue Editor & Senior
Research Analyst

Astrid Forberg Ryan
Senior Research Analyst &
Development Officer

Paul Romita
Deputy Editor of What's in Blue &
Senior Research Analyst

Victor Casanova Abos
Research Analyst

Dahlia Morched
Research Analyst &
Communications Coordinator

Vladimir Sesar
Research Analyst

Eran Sthoeger
Research Analyst

Benjamin Villanti
Research Analyst

Robbin VanNewkirk
Publications Coordinator

Lindiwe Knutson
Research Assistant

Audrey Waysse
Operations Manager

Maritza Tenerelli
Administrative Assistant

Stevenson Swanson
Copy Editor (Consultant)

Security Council Report is a non-profit organisation supported by the Governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste and Turkey, and Carnegie Corporation, Humanity United and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Design Point Five, NY

Security Council Report
One Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza
885 2nd Ave at 48th St, 21st Floor
New York NY 10017

Telephone +1 212 759 6394
Fax +1 212 759 4038
Web securitycouncilreport.org
whatsinblue.org

