Istituto Affari Internazionali

Report of the Seminar "The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

Jacopo Leone

Abstract

In the framework of the IAI-University of Kiel project on "The European Union and the Reform of the United Nations" (Effective Multilateralism), the present report offers an account of the positions and ideas that emerged during the second meeting of Working Group I on "The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?", held in Rome on 14 May 2010. With its concise overview of all the papers presented at the conference and the relative debates, this report is meant to provide a basis for fruitful further reflection in view of the project's final conference, to be held in Berlin at the beginning of 2011.

Keywords: *UN Security Council Reform / European Union / United States / G8/G20 / Germany*

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

**Report of the Conference
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"**

by Jacopo Leone[*]

The 2nd meeting of Working Group I on "The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?" was held at the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) in Rome, on 14 May 2010. The event was organized in the framework of the project "The European Union and the Reform of the United Nations" (Effective Multilateralism), which is carried out by the University of Kiel and the IAI, with the support of the Volkswagen Stiftung.

The conference was divided into three parts. Session I began with an historical analysis of the Reform of the UN Security Council (SC) and an assessment of the latest developments registered on the issue. Session II was more restricted, focusing on the evolving role of the UN SC in international security and its effective contribution as a legitimiser and legislator to the preservation of global stability. To conclude, session III tried to evaluate the EU's contribution to the effectiveness of the UN SC, suggesting various political aspects where the EU seems indeed able to constitute an additional value for the UN as a whole.

Session I

An introductory speech was given by Ambassador Michael Freiherr von Ungern-Sternberg, Director General for the United Nations of the German Federal Foreign Office. The speech, which reflected only the speaker's personal positions and not the official German point of view, carefully analysed the logic behind the UN SC reform, offering some insights on possible successful solutions and on the role the EU could obtain in these new potential arrangements.

According to Ambassador Von Sternberg, it is useful to divide the merit of the SC reform into its substance, procedure, and main actors/groups. Indeed, the substance of the reform is to better reflect the current geopolitical reality, which witnesses the end of the Permanent 5's (United States, Russia, France, United Kingdom and China) domination of global politics and the simultaneous growing influence of the southern states in Africa and South America. A better power arrangement within the UN therefore appears necessary, in order to reaffirm the legitimacy of UN political action on a global scale. The procedure applied to achieve this reform, however, has so far obtained limited results. A shared consensus has been the ultimate goal at the basis of 30 years of debate, but no concrete and durable outcome has emerged. In order to overcome this stalemate a different solution, able to obtain widespread political

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

support, should be put forward and a vote by the General Assembly requested on its merit.

In the opinion of Ambassador Sternberg, the G4 group seems to have, among the other proposals of reform, the largest support possible at the present time. Trying to imagine the future global balance of power, the G4 proposal has the potential to rebalance in a credible way the political weight of the SC, underlining the importance of 'permanency' for those additional permanent members suggested in its scheme. On this point, China and Russia have decided to adopt a rather conservative position, due in part to the thorny issue of Japan and its potential role in the future SC arrangement. On the other hand, the attitude displayed by the United States well illustrates a potential risk of further postponing the reform of the UN SC. Indeed, although friends of the UN in theory, the United States has repeatedly preferred alternative fora to discuss global threats and crises, adopting a very pragmatic approach. The G20 forum stands, in this regard, as the main current competitor of the UN's global authority. The fact that the United States decided to discuss the critical issue of climate change mainly during G20 meetings is a good example of this tendency.

Although able to better reflect the current global balance of power, the G20 represents a serious risk for the legitimacy of international governance. In fact, its unofficial and informal nature is incapable of strong political legitimacy, limiting in this way its credibility in deciding security and military issues. In this regard, the role of the EU and its effective battle to maintain the discussion on climate change within the UN has to be considered a huge contribution, both to the consistency of the international legal system and to the integrity of the UN itself.

Overall, it is therefore possible to feel after 30 years of consultations a sense of urgency and a growing necessity to achieve successful reform of the UN SC. In order to do so, the obstinate research for a general consensus has to be replaced with a vote by the General Assembly, able to ultimately overcome the current political impasse. Since none of the main reform proposals appear to have strong support, an interim arrangement with renewable long-term seats looks like the most probable solution. In such conditions, the potential role of the EU remains obscure. Ambassador Sternberg expressly recognized the need for an EU seat in the renewed SC, but also underlined how at the moment this outcome appears highly unrealistic. The main reasons for this failure are the absence of a EU common position on several security issues (i.e. Palestine and Kosovo), together with the lack of serious political incentives to promote a single authoritative European voice. The nationalistic reluctance of France and United Kingdom, both permanent members of the SC, only accentuates these difficulties.

Nevertheless, the EU could enhance its political power within the UN through a stronger and closer coordination between Washington and Brussels. The recent creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS) could represent in this sense a valuable opportunity. To conclude, a more coordinated EU action depends ultimately on the ability to have operative and political discussions in Brussels, and the desire to play an important role within the UN system.

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

A legal perspective on UN SC reform was articulated by Natalino Ronzitti, Professor of International Law and Scientific Advisor at IAI, and author of a background paper on "The Reform of the UN Security Council". [1] By recognizing the existence of a broad consensus on the necessity of SC reform, the analysis focused mainly on the scope and the content of such a reform, and how it might be successfully achieved.

Among others, there are three noticeable reasons for reforming the UN SC:
i) the transformation of the international community and the meaning of security after the end of the Cold War;
ii) an insufficient geographical representation;
iii) its declining legitimacy as a legislator for ensuring global governance.

Although some actors argue against a reform of the SC on the ground that an excessively large, expanded body will be less efficient, a vast agreement exists on the need to complete SC reform as soon as possible. Whether this is feasible, however, is still uncertain.

From a legal point of view, the procedure through which the UN SC might be reformed assumes primary relevance. Both the amendment and review procedures are carefully regulated by the UN Charter (Art. 108 and 109), leaving no space to obtain a comprehensive reform of the SC through practice. After the first (and only) SC reform, which took place in 1963 to increase the non-permanent members from 6 to 10, a serious debate emerged regarding the necessity of substantially reforming the SC and its veto rule, with the establishment in 1993 of an "Open-ended working group" responsible for finding a consensual solution. Although no formal limitations are envisaged by the UN Charter, the content of a possible SC reform will always have to take into account the actors' legal personality. Indeed, according to Art. 4 of the Charter, only States may be parties to the Organisation. To be elected, therefore, new permanent or non-permanent members will have to be States, referring to the strict meaning this word assumes under international law.

In relation to this aspect, the role of the EU and its ambition to obtain a unified seat on the reformed SC appear rather frustrated. Since it does not comply to the statehood criterion required by Article 4, the EU is ultimately ineligible and its SC membership for the time is unrealistic. Moreover, the legal personality of the EU, as formally embodied in the Lisbon Treaty, does not open up any new prospects. As a result, the most rational alternative seems the achievement of a stronger coordination among EU members, using the novel figure of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy to advocate effectively for EU interests. Coordination, however, has its limits: the Lisbon Treaty expressly safeguards the responsibility attributed by the UN Charter to the SC members, including the right of veto of permanent members.

---

[1] N. Ronzitti, *The Reform of the UN Security Council*, paper produced in the framework of the project "The European Union and the Reform of the United Nations" (Effective Multilateralism), conducted by the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) in Rome and the Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Politics, at the Christian Albrechts – University of Kiel (CAU) with the support of the Volkswagen Stiftung, presented at the second meeting of the Working Group I "The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?", Rome, 14 May 2010. Forthcoming.

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

In a nutshell, although a broad consensus exists on the necessity of SC reform, international law requires a formal procedure for which the essential political agreement appears still remote. At the same time, however, alternative solutions outside the UN framework are not very desirable. Indeed, informal structures like the G8/G20 do not have the legislative power to impose sanctions on a global scale, but rather can only deliberate on decisions which States are then obliged to implement. For this reason, the only solution is the rapid achievement of a better representation of the international community within the UN SC, overcoming the contentious issues of the right of veto and the number of additional permanent and non-permanent members.

In the conclusion of session I, Peter Brownfeld, Second Secretary at the United States (US) Embassy in Rome, briefly presented the US position regarding the reform of the UN SC.

It is the strong opinion of the US that the UN SC needs to better reflect the current geopolitical reality. This attitude is manifest in the Obama Administration, which deems multilateralism as a crucial approach to global governance and the UN as the most valuable forum to address a wide range of significant issues. Non-proliferation, a US foreign policy priority which has been debated mainly within the UN framework, is a good example of this commitment to the Organisation.

In order to make the SC more balanced, the US highlights two key principles: legitimacy and efficiency. The best way to guarantee the respect of both of these parameters is a 'country specific' enlargement of the SC, including only those States that are able to fulfill a series of criteria. In practice, new permanent and non-permanent members will have to qualify with regard to a number of aspects, like commitment to democracy and human rights, significant military capability, and relevant population. The US considers these conditions compulsory to achieve a successful SC reform, even prior to the principle of geographical representation. Moreover, the veto system should remain unchanged, and only a modest expansion in the number of the SC members should be debated.

The discussion that followed the three presentations mainly focused on three aspects:

- *The UN Security Council between representativeness and effectiveness*
Although reform of the SC is at the moment highly desirable, it might soon enough become an inevitable necessity, since the SC appears increasingly unable to set the global political agenda, losing part of its legitimacy within the international community.

In order to reverse this perilous tendency, a sound SC reform needs to carefully balance the representativeness and effectiveness of the Organisation. Indeed, on the one hand an efficient SC is a necessary condition for the exercise of its political role and the implementation of its governance. On the other hand, however, a credible level of representation needs to be preserved, given the ample set of powers the SC can use (i.e. the launch of peacekeeping/peacebuilding operations, or the imposition of sanctions).

As the previous presentations highlighted, a consensus on these aspects has not yet emerged. Even if a political agreement to tackle the use of the veto could be imagined,

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

a substantial change in the veto system, possibly the most divisive issue of a possible SC reform, seems rather unrealistic. An early vote, rejecting the logic of general consensus, could represent a solution to overcome the present stalemate. Nevertheless, to be legitimate any reform will have to ultimately obtain broad agreement between the parties. After all, there seems to be no effortless alternative to such a difficult political path.

- *The emergence of alternative fora: the case of the G8/G20*
It has been already noted how the loss of effectiveness by the SC is enhancing under several aspects the relevance of other informal, more inclusive international fora. The main example of such a trend is the growing political authority of the G8/G20. One reason at the basis of this dynamic is the excessive weight international law plays within the UN, constraining its political essence. However, although significant and useful, the G8/G20 like other fora of the same kind, do not have the capacity to substitute the SC and the legitimacy of the UN. Indeed, given their informal nature, the G8/G20 lack the authority to make binding decisions and exert a lawful role in the global governance.

Entirely dismissing the potential contribution of the G8/G20 would be, nevertheless, a mistake. On the contrary, a clear assessment of their role should be included in the debate on a SC reform, making them part of a successful solution. The option of taking informal decisions in the G8/G20 framework and then have them formalized by the SC has also been suggested.

- *The internal relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly*
In the recent years a shift of powers from the General Assembly to the SC seems to have taken place within the UN. General provisions are increasingly adopted by the SC, bypassing the legitimizing function of the General Assembly. Such behavior could represent a threat to the accountability. Instead, consultation between the two organs should be strengthened through regular and formalized meetings, sharing information and improving cooperation.

Session II

Session II of the discussion was ushered in by Rein Müllerson, Rector at the University Nord of Tallinn. In his presentation, Professor Müllerson offered an interesting analysis of the contradictions of the UN legal personality.

The presentation started with the legitimizing role on issues of peace and security played by the UN SC. According to Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, the SC is the only international authority which has the legitimacy to authorize actions to secure global peace. In this regard, several historical cases seem to suggest a flexible concept of legitimacy, which is not only about legal forms but also about the moral behavior adopted by international actors.

A clear example of this state of things is the 1999 NATO Kosovo operation, which was carried out without the SC's authorization. Interesting enough, the operation was

rapidly defined as 'illegal but legitimate', suggesting a double level of lawfulness, especially when humanitarian issues (as it was in Kosovo) are involved. Contrary to the concept of legality, the notion of legitimacy is hard to define, since it seems to clearly involve an additional normative aspect or a sense of fairness and justice. In practice, therefore, legality and legitimacy do not always overlap, introducing a series of practical risks for UN efforts towards global governance. The case of the controversial 1441 UN resolution, which would have made the March 2003 invasion of Iraq lawful, well shows this tension. Did the resolution in question make the invasion of Iraq a legitimate one, rather than a legal one? Although States usually prefer to rely on arguments of legality, a growing relevance of the legitimacy justification is observable in the international community.

Overall, the legitimacy of international peace and security issues seems often a matter of degree, from fully legitimate to completely illegitimate. Legality remains an important part of the concept of legitimacy, but it is not the whole story. In order to better exert its legitimizing role, the UN should therefore carefully understand this condition, using both these notions to enhance its leading function.

On the other side of the analysis, the UN Charter does not provide the SC with genuine legislative power, instead defining its role as the principal executive organ of the Organisation. However, recently it has been argued that traditional law-making mechanisms are often incapable of producing general law in a short time span, like when an emergency situation rapidly evolves in the international community. In this regard, the SC appears to have filled a gap, offering through its rapid executive power normative responses which are ultimately able to substitute a legislative act stricto sensu. If member states actively support such SC resolutions, there appears to be no real need to see whether they are legal or not. Although some risks might follow from such practice, this kind of executive action have the same value as international law, creating in several occasions legal obligations for UN member States.

The brief discussion that followed the presentation mainly focused on two aspects:

- *The domestic side of legality*
Although it is true that in some cases executive actions, if supported by a large number of international actors, could constitute a source of international law, it is important to consider the domestic relevance of legality. Indeed, like the Italian and the German ones, some national constitutions expressly require an international legal basis to participate in military interventions or other instances of the use of force. This aspect should not be easily dismissed, and well highlights the limits of such an international practice.

- *Some observations on the notion of legitimacy*
It has been suggested how the concept of legitimacy is usually used when there is no agreement on what is legally binding. Since what is formally legal is easily determined, a trend to affirm the idea of legitimacy, or substantive legality, in international relations has recently become more pronounced. This dynamic, however, brings in values and moral considerations, which are not easily universally codified.

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

Moreover, we are presented with the question of how to decide over the legitimacy of the norm-setter. Who is entitled to elaborate normative or moral considerations and produce on their basis (substantive) international law? Is the SC the right forum to exert such powers? Could single States go beyond the SC if this organ is not able to reach a convincing decision, and maybe launch a military intervention? All these questions will need to be answered, in order to reduce as much as possible the risk of abuse of such an emerging practice.

Session III

As mentioned above, the conclusive session III of the panel focused on the EU's contribution to the effectiveness of the UN Security Council. The session began with the presentation by Nicoletta Pirozzi, researcher at the IAI in Rome, of her paper on "The EU's contribution to the effectiveness of the UN Security Council: representation, coordination and outreach", which aimed at gathering preliminary ideas on the possible EU role within a renewed UN SC. [2]

In accordance with this aspect, the analysis took into account three specific dimensions: the coordination of EU members in the SC, their representation at the UN level, and the EU contribution in terms of both process and outreach to crucial policy areas like peacekeeping, non-proliferation and environmental issues.

Under several aspects the first two dimensions appear largely codependent. In the opinion of Ms. Pirozzi, speculations on the idea of an EU permanent seat are ultimately sterile. Indeed, relevance should be placed on the opportunities introduced by the Lisbon Treaty and its innovations which suggest how to reinforce those practices already in place. In this regard, the recognition of the EU's legal personality (Article 47 of the TUE), the elimination of the pillar structure, and the unification of the European Commission's Delegation in New York with the EU Council Secretariat's Liaison Office, all represent a substantial opportunity to achieve a more coordinated and representative EU role at the UN SC.

In addition to these innovations, the creation of a European External Action Service (EEAS), which will assist the High Representative in fulfilling his/her mandate, seems to represent an added value. It should in fact facilitate the emergence of a single EU voice, enhancing cooperation among EU member States as already provided for by Article 34 of the TEU. The role of Lady Ashton, current EU High Representative, is therefore crucial under several aspects. The objective is to establish a single point of reference for UN institutions and member States, thus ensuring an increased EU visibility and continuity.

---

[2] N. Pirozzi, *The EU Contribution to the Effectiveness of the UN Security Council: Representation, Coordination and Outreach*, paper produced in the framework of the project "The European Union and the Reform of the United Nations" (Effective Multilateralism), conducted by the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) in Rome and the Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Politics, at the Christian Albrechts – University of Kiel (CAU) with the support of the Volkswagen Stiftung, presented at the second meeting of the Working Group I "The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?", Rome, 14 May 2010. Forthcoming.

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

Turning to the third dimension of the analysis and to more substantial matters, the potential EU contribution to the UN SC's issues can be divided into three specific areas: peacekeeping, non-proliferation, and the environment.

On peacekeeping, a successful partnership between the EU and the UN is already in place, defined by a joint declaration in 2003, in the areas of planning, training, communication and best practice. Moreover, the EU has contributed operationally to UN peacekeeping missions in many ways and with different levels of success. Although it still represents the most advanced form of international-regional peacekeeping cooperation, practical EU-UN interaction in the field has not always been easy. In addition, EU member States have become more and more reluctant to deploy their personnel in the framework of UN missions. The main reason for this reluctance seems to be the lack of a clear EU strategic identity, with the identification of strategic priorities and conditions for intervention only after a request by the SC. Nevertheless, new routes to cooperation can be developed. An EU rapid deployment capability could indeed strengthen EU-UN cooperation, implementing the civilian component of multidimensional peacekeeping/peacebuilding. The same could be said regarding the political and operational support given to the African Union's efforts to develop African capabilities to address, in the long term, peace and security challenges.

Turning to the second policy area, the EU contribution in the field of non-proliferation can be carefully analysed through the E3/EU Iran initiative. Here the E3/EU action, which was initially opposed by some EU member States (notably Italy and the Netherlands) and did not receive formal endorsement from EU institutions until November 2004, offers both positive and negative insights. Indeed, on the one hand, the E3/EU initiative can be viewed as a good example of a contribution to enhance the role of the UN SC, to which it usually referred and harmonized its approach. On the other hand, however, the E3/EU strategy has failed so far in making the Iranian government comply with the international non-proliferation regime. The reason for this failure is possibly the incoherent definition of goals by the EU and the disjointed conduct of diplomacy, leaving the E3/EU incapable to mediate between the Iranians and the international community.

To conclude, climate change has become in recent years a major political issue for both the EU and the UN SC. Since the 1990s, the EU has increasingly assumed a leadership position on climate change, unilaterally committing to a 20% cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. Nevertheless, the impact of this leadership by example has been comparatively limited. The EU's performance in the UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in December 2009 demonstrated well such weaknesses, and has been generally judged a failure of the EU's international diplomatic efforts. The reason is probably to be found in the multiple political representations of the EU member States, which sensibly undermined the EU negotiators' position impeding a sufficient degree of flexibility during negotiations with third countries. The way forward should therefore include an evolution of the EU position on climate change, able to respond to the needs and concerns of emerging powers, including financial assistance and direct investments.

Overall, the paper highlighted the necessity for the EU to identify clear strategic priorities, in order to better deal with the other members of the international community,

both within the UN and other frameworks. The Lisbon Treaty appears to offer a valuable occasion to do so. New instruments and structures are now at the disposal of the EU, enabling it to finally abide by its proclaimed commitment to effective multilateralism, starting with the UN SC.

The conclusive presentation of the panel was offered by Daniele Marchesi, PhD candidate at the University of Cologne, based on his article "The EU Common Foreign and Security Policy in the UN Security Council: Between Representation and Coordination".   The analysis tried mainly to unveil the link between the debate on UN SC reform and the way the EU shares information, coordinates, and is represented in New York and in Brussels on issues related to the scope of the UN SC.

The EU, as a post-modern supranational-intergovernmental actor, necessarily has a structural difficulty in coordinating effectively in the UN SC, which is largely dominated by national interests and sovereignty concerns. Although it is generally recognized that 'Europeanization' and 'Brusselization' have been rather limited so far in this particular context, an increasing cooperative effort is displayed on the part of the EU member States, and a number of provisions and practices have been institutionalized. This political dynamic of 'limited institutionalization' is further illustrated through three different dimensions: (i) functional, (ii) sociological, and (iii) institutional.

On a functional level, the EU seems to have developed a fairly solid partnership with the UN SC, however slowly and painfully achieved. Information sharing and coordination are considered as standardized practices, and when the EU does have a common position it is often able to obtain and increase its visibility. This has favored a limited Brusselization of European foreign policy, with a clear influence on EU integration. Turning to the sociological aspect, the practices and norms surrounding SC membership substantially restrain the willingness of member States to defend potential EU common positions. Indeed, such alternative behaviors would be considered 'inappropriate' and counterproductive in the SC context. For this reason, EU members in the SC have to maintain a difficult equilibrium between being pro-EU and defend their particular national interests. After all, what is considered appropriate in the EU is not a pure supranational conduct but rather a focus on identity and the achievement of inter-relational objectives.

Lastly, from an institutional perspective, the French and the British 'veto player' behavior is grounded in an institutional context, which locked them into a privileged position which they are unlikely to renounce. Historically and legally established by the UN Charter, this peculiar institutional arrangement is further safeguarded by Article 34 of the TUE, which prioritizes the responsibilities of the SC permanent members (France and United Kingdom) over their membership of the EU. This corroborates the institutional argument that coexisting institutions are often mutually reinforcing and can enhance the overall stability of a system. At the same time however, the stalemate at the UN institutional level (no UN reform) has produced incentives for all actors to increase coordination and institutionalization. Overall though, the ambiguity between intergovernmental and supranational tensions in the EU's institutional structure will remain, with noticeable effects on its actions in the UN framework.

In the conclusion of the presentation, the analysis made some speculative steps, trying to imagine the impact of possible UN SC reform on European foreign policy. Two possible scenarios were suggested.

- *Germany as a permanent member (G4)*. This first scenario hypothesizes an enlarged UN SC with Germany as a new permanent member. In such conditions, the E3/EU ad hoc structure (Germany, France and United Kingdom) is likely to be institutionalized. A fair degree of flexibility and power will characterize the arrangement, with an intrinsic lack of accountability which would push German foreign policy towards constantly privileging national concerns. As pointed out before, this is to be expected especially when considering the logic of 'appropriateness' within the SC. For all these reasons it is plausible that this type of scenario would entail a rollback of the progress made by the EU in security coordination, putting an end to the EU single seat rhetoric and favoring a short term animosity between EU members. Moreover, this reduced sense of shared responsibility could diminish the engagement in European foreign policy of those States outside the E3/EU, eventually overburdening the E3/EU formation itself. Therefore, without a number of mechanisms for coordination and accountability towards the rest of the EU members, it is hard to see how this particular arrangement would be sustainable in the long term.

- *New non-permanent members/rotating/renewable (UfC)*. According to this second scenario, the SC reform should avoid new permanent members and focus on other alternatives: new longer-term seats, rotating regional seats, or renewable elective seats. Since the EU member State(s) elected to hold the SC seat would be accountable to the membership and would therefore maintain a strong informational link with the other member States, it is possible to imagine a strengthening of coordination between the EU members under this particular arrangement. In this regard, the innovations of the Lisbon Treaty will represent a valuable tool for further increasing accountability. Eventually this would open the door to a common EU seat and the introduction of some degree of majority voting in European foreign policy, without which a single EU seat would lead to substantial paralysis. Nevertheless, the biggest risk of such a scenario remains its effectiveness and the capacity of the EU to put forward relevant proposals and to negotiate proactively a harmony of interests that the EU has too often failed to achieve.

What emerges is therefore the clear influence the UN reform debate has had on European foreign policy. Opposing strategies as well as institutional and sociological logic all resulted in an ambiguous process of internal coordination and limited institutionalization. Whether the reform of the SC would ultimately strengthen the current trend towards a limited E3/EU directorate or encourage new patterns of information sharing and coordination remains an open question.

After these two conclusive presentations, the discussion proceeded by highlighting the following issues:

Documenti IAI 1011

Report of the Seminar
"The Reform of the UN Security Council: What Role for the EU?"

- *How to improve the EU structural arrangements at the UN*
From a political point of view, the establishment of a link between the UN SC reform and the creation of a more effective EU foreign policy is highly perilous. The need for more effective EU action is indeed real, whether the SC reform is going to take place or not. In this regard, the strengthening of the EU internal institutional arrangement seems to represent a fertile possibility. A stronger focus should be put on Brussels and New York to achieve a more coordinated debate among EU members, together with more effective diplomacy and lobby work in national capitals. This would allow for the shaping of a common EU position, without however denying national and European diplomats room to maneuver.

- *How to improve EU political effectiveness at the UN*
When the political aspect of EU effectiveness in the field of foreign policy is analysed, several aspects appear relevant. First of all, it is necessary to decide who should represent the EU at the UN. The Lisbon Treaty, with the creation of a High Representative and a President of the Union, offered a clear answer, which nonetheless needs to be acknowledged by EU member States. Moreover, although the new provisions included in the Lisbon Treaty could simplify EU action, the need to identify precise strategic priorities and achieve a common vision on the UN SC reform still remain on the table. Such a proactive role, which will allow the EU to not only take into account the UN agenda but to actually shape it, is a fundamental element of a potential EU global authority.

On a more practical level, the EU should continue its activeness in the field of peacekeeping, backing the AU-UN Prodi's Report of 2008 on modalities for support to African Union peacekeeping operations. The same thing goes with regard to its non-proliferation policy, trying to broaden as much as possible the Iranian issue by including more general aspects like civilian nuclear development and fissile material cut-offs.

The outcome of the meeting will constitute the basis for further reflection in the view of the final conference of the project, which will be held in Berlin at the beginning of 2011. The conclusive summaries of the meetings together with all the papers presented and possibly other contributions will then converge in a single document, to be published shortly.

Updated: 12 July 2010

Istituto Affari Internazionali

The Institute

The Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI), founded by Altiero Spinelli in 1965, does research in the fields of foreign policy, political economics and international security. A non-profit organisation, the IAI aims to further and disseminate knowledge through research studies, conferences and publications. To that end, it cooperates with other research institutes, universities and foundations in Italy and abroad and is a member of various international networks.
More specifically, the main research sectors are: European institutions and policies; Italian foreign policy; trends in the global economy and internationalisation processes in Italy; the Mediterranean and the Middle East; defence economy and policy; and transatlantic relations. The IAI puts out an English-language quarterly (The International Spectator), an online webzine (AffarInternazionali), a series of research papers (IAI Quaderni) and an Italian foreign policy yearbook (La politica estera dell'Italia).