

Conference Paper

International Law Programme | October 2019

‘Our Shared Humanity’ The Legacy of Kofi Annan



**CHATHAM
HOUSE**
The Royal Institute of
International Affairs

Contents

About the Conference	2
Foreword	3
Taking Inspiration from Kofi Annan	5
Conference Report	8
Conference Agenda	24
Acknowledgments	28

About the Conference

In the run-up to the UN’s 75th anniversary and almost a year after his death, Chatham House and the United Nations Association – UK (UNA-UK) held a two-day conference to explore Kofi Annan’s legacy in the context of the current period of global uncertainty.

The ‘Our Shared Humanity’ conference brought together a global and diverse group of individuals working on peace and security, human rights and development issues to:

- Reflect critically on Annan’s record, and capture lessons learned from his tenure as UN secretary-general, and his later work as a mediator and elder statesperson; and
- Generate recommendations for current policymakers and influencers.

This paper summarizes key points raised during each session of the conference, and presents the substantive recommendations that emerged from the discussion.

In order to bring the conference themes to a wider audience, UNA-UK held a public event at the end of the first day of the conference at Central Hall Westminster – where the UN had held its first ever meetings in 1946 – with speakers including Nane Annan, Sherrie Westin (president of global impact and philanthropy, Sesame Workshop), Amina Mohammed (current UN deputy secretary-general) and Mary Robinson (chair of The Elders and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights).

Foreword

Mark Malloch-Brown

Kofi Annan spoke to us all. This conference, devoted both to his legacy and to the lessons it offers for the UN’s future, illustrated that fact. Many of those who contributed had worked with him and shared recollections of his personal affection and attention.

The power of his personality, still so evident at the conference, might suggest his success was just one of character – a disarming, engaging manner in an angry world. However, what this conference demonstrated was that this warmth and dignity in his personal dealings went so much wider. His ability to speak to the peoples of the United Nations – across barriers of race and religion and conflict, whether rich or poor, young or old, woman or man – made him a universal figure. A communicator-general.

His leadership of the UN came at a moment of hope, after the Cold War, and was buoyed by that ambition until 9/11 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that followed it. He presided over a period of expansive ambition in multilateralism, when he could seed new initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals, the Global Fund against HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases, cooperation with the private sector, a dramatic expansion of peacekeeping operations and a relaunch of the UN’s human rights work, among others. Yet as secretary-general he also later had to battle the aftermath of 9/11 and its wars, the early beginnings of a retreat from multilateralism, and the return to suspicion and hostility among major powers.

The UN and its secretary-general are never free agents. As the first secretary-general to have risen through the ranks, he knew better than any that the UN’s ambitions are constrained by its member states. A great secretary-general can challenge member states to do more, but ultimately cannot resist them when the tide turns against international engagement. As he often observed, you cannot change the wind but you can bend the sail. His was the art of the possible.

Participants pointed to a confluence of challenges that today are putting the hard-won gains of the Annan era, and indeed the future of the rules-based international system, at risk. These challenges are:

- Environmental – as seen in the greater urgency and impact of the climate crisis, biodiversity loss, the health impacts of pollution etc.
- Economic – as seen in the 2008 global financial crisis, the causes of which have yet to be addressed, and the consequences of which continue to be felt by the poorest among us.
- Social – the fraying of the social contract due to the inability of governments to guarantee jobs for citizens, address inequalities or manage globalization, and a growing disconnect between publics and their leaders and institutions.
- Political – a resurgence in violence (e.g. the fact that civilian casualties are on the rise after many decades of falling, a spike in extremism, homicides overtaking conflict deaths), the backlash on human rights and gender equality, greater multipolarity and polarization, and big-power tensions.

The above challenges are unfolding in the context of mega-trends – for example, around demography, mobility and technology – that are creating serious challenges for multilateralism precisely when it is needed the most. We see the renegeing on commitments, and more emphasis on ‘mini-lateralism’ and ad hoc policymaking.

But the contemporary political and policy climate is also generating new forms of agreements – such as the Paris Agreement on climate change and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – that are voluntary, anchored in self-examination and peer review, and predicated on multi-stakeholder action and partnerships. As the UN approaches its 75th anniversary in 2020, there are opportunities (such as the green economy, technology) for progress, but they require cooperation within and across borders, sectors and generations.

Recommendations included revitalizing (as Annan had done) the process of senior UN appointments, modernizing the UN’s communications, engaging civil society and encouraging youth participation, and further recognizing the role of entrepreneurship in addressing society’s challenges.

As the UN approaches its 75th anniversary in 2020, there are opportunities for progress, but they require cooperation within and across borders, sectors and generations.

These two days reminded us of what we have lost in multilateralism and what we must recover. Kofi Annan never gave up. His foundation, which he began when he left the UN, engages in conflict resolution, and in supporting democracy, youth and agriculture in Africa – all causes close to his heart. His post-UN work from the platform of a small but nimble foundation may also point to a final lesson of the Annan legacy: some of the most innovative future multilateralism may happen on the margins, outside the official structures of the UN proper.

Lord Mark Malloch-Brown served under Kofi Annan in a number of roles, as administrator of the UN Development Programme, the secretary-general’s chef de cabinet and UN deputy secretary-general.

Taking Inspiration from Kofi Annan

Robin Niblett

On 3 and 4 June 2019, Chatham House hosted a major conference in partnership with the United Nations Association – UK (UNA-UK), supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Open Society Foundations, to reflect on the lessons learned from the remarkable life of Kofi Annan, who served as UN secretary-general from 1997 to 2006 and passed away on 18 August 2018.

The conference fell on the same days as Donald Trump’s state visit to the UK, which, though coincidental, brought into stark relief the ways in which current changes in international relations are affecting Annan’s legacy of UN-led multilateralism, which Ban Ki-moon and now António Guterres have carried forward.

A vision of multilateral governance

Annan advocated a vision of multilateral governance, anchored in shared responsibility for global challenges and in the promotion of the rights and dignity of the individual. He placed the importance of individual freedom and justice alongside the global challenges of reducing poverty and improving health outcomes. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the UN Global Fund on HIV/AIDS, which brought together both strands of his approach to global governance, stand among his landmark contributions to international affairs.

[The Millennium Development Goals \(MDGs\) and the UN Global Fund on HIV/AIDS, which brought together both strands of his approach to global governance, stand among his landmark contributions to international affairs.](#)

Annan’s time as secretary-general also saw him involved in managing numerous crises. The 2003 US-led military intervention in Iraq raised acute questions about the purpose and future of the UN Security Council. The aftermath of the conflict also exposed serious failings in the broader UN system under his leadership.

It was to his credit that he leveraged the investigation into the corruption surrounding the UN’s 1995–2003 ‘oil-for-food’ programme in order to introduce procedures for greater scrutiny over UN financial programmes and personnel appointments. In 2000, he set up and then took on board the criticisms of the Brahimi Report into the failed UN peacekeeping operations in Rwanda and Srebrenica during his tenure as undersecretary-general for peacekeeping.

Global governance on the defensive

One can look back at Annan’s term as UN secretary-general as a period when ideas for how to improve global governance were in the ascendant, despite the persistence of civil wars and interstate disputes. Today, the persistence of long-standing conflicts and growing competition between the world’s major powers appear to be overwhelming the global agenda, putting ideas for global governance on the defensive.

America’s purposeful disengagement from and disruption of the multilateral institutions that it helped establish during the 20th century are a major factor in this shift. The principal difference with the Cold War is that China’s rise might divide America from its allies rather than unite it with them.

China has become embedded in the global economy that America championed, creating new webs of interdependence. At the same time, China is promoting a system of domestic and international governance that gives primacy to the state over the rights of the individual. In recent years, China has not only supported the world’s most repressive regimes, such as North Korea, Venezuela and Zimbabwe, but has also underwritten corrupt and opaque practices in countries in Southeast Asia and Africa. And it is offering new digital surveillance tools that leaders in these countries can use to suppress popular dissent.

This rise of a more competitive international system has had a negative effect on Annan’s legacy, eroding some of its highlights, such as expectations for the ‘responsibility to protect’ doctrine, and weakening multilateralism and respect for human rights in general.

Despite concerns over its direction, most states around the world – even US allies in Europe and Asia – continue to engage with China. America, however, has decided to challenge it. With the world’s two most powerful states in confrontation, and Russia happy to play a disruptive role in between, there is little scope for state-led multilateralism to regain its momentum.

This rise of a more competitive international system has had a negative effect on Annan’s legacy, eroding some of its highlights, such as expectations for the ‘responsibility to protect’ doctrine, and weakening multilateralism and respect for human rights in general.

The question for the future is whether Annan’s successors can build on the more radical, transformative aspects of his tenure and bypass this state-led confrontation. The shift from the MDGs to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) could prove critical in this respect.

A more inclusive approach to complex problem-solving

In order to have a chance of achieving the SDGs, the world needs to deploy a more inclusive approach to complex problem-solving of the sort that Annan promoted with his Global Compact. Bringing the private sector and civil society proactively into multilateral responses offers the only prospect for ending poverty, reducing inequalities, building sustainable cities, shifting to responsible production and consumption, and realizing the other SDGs.

A more inclusive approach also means giving a greater sense of agency to individuals, who can now mobilize digitally and engage in responding to global challenges – such as creating more energy-efficient and climate-friendly lifestyles – with minimal government support. Annan was a pioneer of this more bottom-up approach to development and rights issues after leaving the UN, through his work on youth leadership against violent extremism and on transforming agriculture in Africa.

Thinking of systemic change as a more societal rather than government-led process demands leaders capable of mobilizing mass individual action towards public policy goals, as reflected, for example, in Secretary-General António Guterres’ High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation.

The fact that Annan was dubbed ‘the secular pope’ by some points to people’s search for leadership on shared global challenges that goes beyond what can be achieved by national action alone. If an important part of his legacy is the idea of more inclusive forms of global governance, then Kofi Annan has provided an essential starting point for the debates that will accompany the UN’s upcoming 75th anniversary.

Dr Robin Niblett CMG is the director of Chatham House. An earlier version of this piece was published on the Chatham House website on 31 May 2019.

Conference Report

1. Key themes and lessons

The conference sessions reflected different elements of the UN’s work and Kofi Annan’s legacy. However, as Annan himself underscored, issues of peace, development and human rights are interconnected, and a number of common themes emerged throughout the conference.

Annan’s leadership style, his ability to communicate with diverse audiences, his commitment to participation and inclusion, his promotion of democratic principles and his emphasis on solidarity were identified as the five fundamental lessons from his legacy. Deficits in those same five areas were also highlighted by conference participants as significant challenges faced by our global system at present.

When considering how to apply lessons from Annan’s legacy to those deficits, participants noted in particular:

1. **The scale, pace and complexity of global challenges.** This means that it is important to set out recommendations on *what*, in the current political environment, the UN can and should do, and how it communicates that.
2. **How the present environment is affecting long-standing challenges faced by the UN,** such as the competing interests of major powers, the different visions that exist for the UN, and the gradual nature of institutional change. This necessitates recommendations around *how* the UN should manage change – including how it embraces complexity.
3. **The changing nature of multilateralism and the rise of new centres and types of power.** This gives rise to recommendations around *who* should lead the process of change.

In discussing all three of the above, participants noted that the UN needs to work out how it relates to states and hard power in the context of the 21st century’s competing approaches to sovereignty. To what extent is the UN a system of checks and balances on states or a rival to state power? How should it handle obstacles and detractors? Should it find other ways to fulfil its objectives – through creative partnerships with other stakeholders, for instance? And which areas should the UN be engaged with, given the multiplicity of actors now able to effect change at both local and global level?

1.1 ‘What’ – contemporary challenges and the UN’s response

Throughout the conference, the importance of placing Annan’s approach and achievements in context was referred to repeatedly. Participants commented that the current era continues to be defined by challenges that Annan grappled with as secretary-general, such as rising inequality, intractable civil wars and debates around sovereignty. However, these issues are now affected by factors such as new and emerging technologies, from the power of social media and big data to cybercrime and election interference – all of which are generating challenges and opportunities of their own.

With hindsight, speakers stressed that Annan’s tenure as secretary-general (and previous role as head of UN Peacekeeping) benefited from the end of the Cold War and, thus, a period of opportunity for value-based, cooperative international relations. Many noted that this provided greater room for manoeuvre for a politically savvy secretary-general, especially one who was strategic about the issues he applied himself to. In this way, Annan was able to make headway on situations such as the Bakassi Peninsula and East Timor, and on issues related to health, for instance.

Other speakers commented that Annan’s personal history as a UN insider also gave him a head start. He did not need time to familiarize himself with the system, its dynamics and personalities. Some argued that this helped to galvanize reform initiatives such as ‘Delivering as One’. Others noted that it meant there were occasions on which Annan shied away from pressing ahead, for instance, on Security Council reform.

With hindsight, speakers stressed that Annan’s tenure as secretary-general (and previous role as head of UN Peacekeeping) benefited from the end of the Cold War and, thus, a period of opportunity for value-based, cooperative international relations.

And yet this same period saw some of the most tragic failures of our global system. These were raised in almost every session of the conference, with speakers focusing particularly on the atrocities of Rwanda and Bosnia, where the shortcomings of a UN-led approach were laid painfully bare. Participants also highlighted the 2003 Iraq war, where the decision of certain member states to intervene militarily without the backing of the Security Council dealt a strong blow to regional stability and to the cause of multilateral cooperation. Participants noted that these events had undermined trust in the central mission of the UN, and in its values, trajectory and capacity. They also noted the ongoing impact of these events on thinking and decision-making today – at the UN and in capitals.

Many speakers highlighted the need for the UN to stand more clearly for normative values, and to focus on the core and irreplaceable elements of the UN’s mission – such as peacebuilding, mediation and human rights. On balance, it was felt that this could help reinvigorate the UN.

1.2 ‘How’ – long-standing challenges and fresh approaches

Over the two days of the conference, speakers and participants noted that faith in global governance appears to have reached a critically low ebb, with declining support for multilateralism among states, rising uncertainty in the value and purpose of the UN, and a growing disconnect between the public and institutions. Nevertheless, it was felt that transformative reform is both possible and necessary. A number of participants referred to the ‘1 for 7 Billion’ campaign,¹ which pushed for greater transparency in the UN secretary-general appointment process, as a recent example of reform sparked by a civil society movement.

As one speaker commented, the situation is now so serious that a ‘minor rearranging’ will not suffice; widespread change is needed. Others commented that as the fundamental political and structural problems the UN faces have not been solved in 75 years, it was difficult to believe they could be

¹ See <http://www.1for7billion.org/>.

addressed in the current environment. This raises a dilemma that the conference acknowledged, with some participants calling for greater ambition and radical change, and others for damage limitation and incremental reform.

Many participants who knew Annan noted the importance he placed on listening to different perspectives and trying to understand the relevant complex contexts of these positions. He also understood that if the perspectives of those at the top are the only views included in deliberations, then the problem-solving capacity of the UN will suffer. Several speakers therefore felt that a potential way forward would be to insist upon an inclusive multi-stakeholder response to global challenges, so that the complex, diverse and multifaceted nature of the problems faced becomes hardwired into the response. When solutions are generated from this form of deep engagement, questions of level of ambition in the abstract are more likely to recede as the conversation shifts to the level of response required by the problem.

1.3 ‘Who’ – emerging actors and new partnerships

A recurring theme of the conference was the multiplicity of actors working on UN issues, as well as the emphasis on partnerships generated by agreements such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Paris Agreement on climate change. Many speakers and participants spoke about the need to look to new allies and new partnerships to mitigate the rise in hostility to multilateralism, and to determine the most appropriate and capable actors involved in different areas of the UN’s work – recognizing that the UN is not always best placed to lead or deliver on particular issues. Creative ways to pursue this direction were identified by participants, such as alliance-building in specific UN committees or bodies, or along thematic areas that enjoy widespread common support, such as protection of civilians and the SDGs.

Annan’s era was described as one which broadened the understanding of stakeholders as problem-solvers, bringing youth, civil society and business to the table.

There were repeated calls for a new multilateralism that embraces a broad range of non-state actors. Annan’s era was described as one which broadened the understanding of stakeholders as problem-solvers, bringing youth, civil society and business to the table. Those who worked with Annan said that he championed civil society leaders wherever he went, offering them a protective space within which they could operate. But it was also noted that civil society space is shrinking, as evidenced by attacks on human rights defenders, as well as by the increasingly politicized NGO accreditation process at the UN. It was felt that the UN needs to clarify how the inevitable challenges arising from a shift to bottom-up approaches will be managed.

The need to improve engagement with the private sector was highlighted throughout the conference – for example in relation to financing and delivering on the SDGs. Annan’s inclusion of businesses meant that they ‘saw they could flourish alongside the UN’s work’. Some participants expressed caution about the significant negative impact on human rights and development that can arise from commercial activities. Others noted that deeper engagement with private-sector actors may help align them to normative standards as well as improve the capacity of the UN to do its work. Overall, it was felt that the diversity of the business community and its reach require a nuanced, strategic approach to its engagement, not least to prevent co-option of a public interest agenda to commercial goals.

2. Recommendations

The conference did not seek to generate agreed recommendations. But, reflecting the wide-ranging discussion, participants did put forward practical recommendations on a broad set of issues: from strengthening peacekeeping efforts to tackling the divisive impact of social media on democratic processes and harnessing data to drive progress on the SDGs. A summary of these recommendations is set out below, with a brief overview of the conference discussion to provide context.

2.1 ‘The arc of intervention’ – panel overview

Peacekeeping, conflict prevention and the ‘responsibility to protect’ (R2P) doctrine dominated this session on peace and security challenges. On peacekeeping, panellists stressed the importance of managing expectations among various stakeholders, from those who develop mandates to host populations. It was noted that evaluating progress needs to take into account diverse mandates, roles and contexts. Conflict continues in some instances where the UN has invested considerable resources (for example, in the Central African Republic and Mali).

Comfort Ero described how unrealistic peacekeeping mandates are ‘almost set up to fail from the start’. Michael Keating reflected that in Somalia, for example, there is no clear political strategy or shared understanding of the nature of the political context. There is a lack of attention to investing in political solutions – a key recommendation of the 2015 report of the High-level Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) was that peacekeeping should be understood as part of a suite of approaches that include intervention, peacebuilding and mediation.

Other points from the HIPPO report were also raised, including partnerships, accountability for sexual exploitation and abuse, improved capacity and performance in the protection of civilians, and a greater sense of local ownership. Panellists discussed Annan’s efforts to cultivate UN partnerships with regional organizations, particularly with the African Union (AU), and how these could be developed and improved, for example by providing more consistent financing.

It was noted that the UN should not be the only problem-solver. In Sudan, for instance, solutions are more likely to come from the country’s neighbours and the region. The AU had its own ‘brand’ of multilateralism in peace and security, and could play a greater role, including on the political side. However, it was also noted that there are limits to what these partnerships can achieve, as conflicts often have international as well as regional dimensions and should be considered ‘international problems that need international solutions’.

In reflecting on the current state of conflict prevention, the panel agreed that while prevention should be prioritized within peace and security discussions, risks emerge if it becomes the sole focus. Preventive diplomacy and early warning have had too few successes – though Madagascar offers one positive example. Opportunities to act early are not being taken consistently enough. Ian Martin reflected on the ‘inability of the Security Council to take what’s seen as to be the most obvious necessary steps’. The situation in Libya was mentioned as warranting an immediate response to prevent the outbreak of serious fighting. The opportunity to act early in Burkina Faso to prevent spillover from issues in Mali was also highlighted.

The panel then discussed the role of the Security Council in the context of the more competitive geopolitical environment. Speakers cautioned that the Council’s lack of action and political will were weakening the role of the UN in addressing conflicts, and could even dismantle this role.

This assessment applied not only to the Council’s inability to agree resolutions on certain situations, but also to its level of support and engagement. Lakhdar Brahimi gave the example of Sudan, where some parties to the conflict were trying to talk to each other. He argued that if the Security Council was not willing to help in such situations, it should at least support the efforts of local actors to mediate.²

Panellists noted that there is a fine balance between raising expectations, managing them and having the political will to achieve them, as Annan was able to do in Kenya in 2007–08. Managing this balance requires leadership, which in turn requires effective appointment processes. Panellists discussed the need for reforming UN recruitment mechanisms to ensure that the most capable candidates from within and outside the UN system are able to rise to senior positions.

Finally, the panel turned to the ability of the international community to prevent atrocities in an environment hostile to multilateralism. This was identified as a major challenge not only to the doctrine of R2P, which Annan championed, and which was endorsed by world leaders in 2005, but also to the legitimacy of the Security Council as a body capable of fulfilling its mandate. In this context, participants discussed the future of R2P. It was emphasized that R2P’s toolbox is not just about military intervention. Is there potential in pursuing humanitarian goals under the R2P label as a means of distancing R2P from its use for regime change in Libya? This approach may garner support even in a divided Security Council. An alternative view put forward suggested that the label of R2P may be tainted beyond recovery, but that some of its ideas and principles remain critical for engagement on mass atrocity prevention.

2.1.1 ‘The arc of intervention’ – recommendations

2.1.1.1 A more collaborative approach

- Foster better integration of UN and regional peace operations:
 - At the tactical and operational levels on the ground.
 - At the strategic and political levels, recognizing that regional peace operations are more likely to succeed if backed by solutions at the international level.
 - In terms of funding, for example when it comes to allocations from the UN’s peacekeeping budget.
- Adopt a more proactive approach to engaging stakeholders, including by:
 - Investing in public communications – in host, troop-contributing and P5 countries – on the role of peace operations and what they can/cannot achieve.
 - Protecting and expanding spaces in UN and other processes for stakeholders to provide meaningful input and relay views and concerns (this should include discussions on R2P as well as on peace operations).
- Build stronger partnerships between stakeholders, including by:
 - Boosting collaboration between states, and between states and civil society, to leverage platforms for action when the Security Council is not able to make headway.
 - Placing more emphasis on building the capacity of local stakeholders to manage the transition from conflict and work with UN and regional actors.

² This comment was made before the subsequent developments in Sudan, including the decision by the AU to suspend Sudan, the breakdown in negotiations and their partial recovery, and allegations of widespread violence.

2.1.1.2 Primacy of politics

- Assert the HIPPO report’s emphasis on the primacy of politics, including through reaffirmations by states and UN officials that peace operations are there to provide space for political solutions; and that missions should respond to the shape of the political context and be grounded in analyses and strategies that recognize local, national, regional and global interests.
- Deploy quiet diplomacy to make a vigorous case for the value of multilateralism to governments’ own interests, complemented by public advocacy and communications in the same vein.
- In the context of R2P, emphasize that its first two pillars – and a significant part of the third – are focused on preventive and political actions, rather than on coercive and military actions, and promote use of the whole R2P ‘toolkit’.

2.1.1.3 Leadership

- Strengthen senior appointment processes to ensure that the leaders within peace operations and political missions have the necessary experience, expertise and independence.
- Find ways to give the special representatives of the UN secretary-general in countries in conflict the necessary political power.
- Ensure that peacekeeping is not involved in counterterrorism and counter-insurgency operations.

2.1.1.4 Mandate-setting

- Assert the HIPPO report’s recommendation that counterterrorism and counter-insurgency do not form part of UN peace operation mandates (this could form part of the discussion on collaboration with regional actors).
- Encourage states to give greater thought to when and how R2P is referenced in resolutions.

2.2 ‘In larger freedom’ – panel overview

This session focused on efforts to support democratic transition and resilience, as well as challenges for the human rights agenda. Annika Savill recounted how Kofi Annan used his Davos speech in 1999 to warn that the absence of a compact to ensure the even spread of the benefits of globalization would encourage the proliferation of ideological and political divisions which could threaten international peace and security. Human rights are central to this idea – but they are increasingly under threat from factors that include populist and authoritarian leaders, attacks against human rights defenders, shrinking civil society space, and the use of new technologies to spread misinformation and hate speech, foment divisions and undermine democracy.

On international efforts to support democratic processes, Raila Odinga reflected on the 2007–08 Kenyan election crisis and Annan’s negotiating strategy. Instead of allowing leaders to arrive with essentially non-negotiable pre-prepared solutions, Annan encouraged them to go through the exercise of researching and analysing the problem collectively, in order to develop a collective solution. Odinga drew lessons from this on the importance of mediation, and of collaborative discussions as opposed to more traditional negotiations on formal lines.

Radhika Coomaraswamy focused her remarks on human rights, noting the backsliding in recent years on civil and political rights in particular – with gender equality and women’s empowerment being perhaps the most prominent examples. However, she also acknowledged progress made on

socio-economic rights, including through the SDGs – which encompassed targets on governance, the rule of law, access to justice and information, and participatory decision-making. This led to a discussion on partnerships for human rights, for example the alliance between the EU and the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation on the Rohingya.

The panel discussed the interplay between human rights and democracy, the role that human rights play in framing and guiding development efforts, and the need for a human rights-based approach to balancing free speech with the need to combat hate speech. Panel members also noted the central role of civil society in defending and advancing human rights. Patrick Gaspard outlined the many spaces – including inside the UN – where civil society space was shrinking. He underscored the need for current leaders to emulate Annan’s practice of speaking out against human rights abuses and championing the voices of civil society actors.

During the session, it was noted several times that the UN had a strong track record in driving normative change, especially with regard to human rights, and that this area represented some of its most enduring successes – even during challenging periods such as the aftermath of 9/11. It was also noted that Annan frequently reminded governments and political leaders that the preamble of the UN Charter opens with ‘we the peoples’, not ‘we the member states’, emphasizing the need to ensure that the UN stands for, and works on behalf of, the global public. These values need to be ingrained into the UN’s narrative, as well as its programme of work. In this regard, the panel made recommendations on improving the UN’s human rights capacity.

It was also noted that Annan frequently reminded governments and political leaders that the preamble of the UN Charter opens with ‘we the peoples’, not ‘we the member states’, emphasizing the need to ensure that the UN stands for, and works on behalf of, the global public.

The relationship between democratic transition and elections was explored through discussion of criteria for the integrity of elections, developed by the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security with Annan’s support.³ These criteria include: reducing barriers to equal political participation, regulating political finance, building the rule of law, using capable independent professional election management bodies, and establishing a mutual security system which secures the survival of the losing political parties. Stephen Stedman discussed how Annan was concerned about the growing impact of social media on democracy and elections, and about the lack of understanding, engagement and influence of policymakers in this sphere.

A better understanding of the dynamics involved in social media use during elections is necessary. For example, one speaker asserted that in the US misinformation through social media is typically spread by those in the 65–80 age group, but that the extent to which this is the case in the rest of the world is unknown. Such information is crucial to shaping appropriate action. Civil society was repeatedly referred to as a key actor with the skill to hold technology companies to account, as has been done with Facebook more recently.

³ Kofi Annan Foundation (2012), ‘Deepening Democracy: A Strategy for Improving Integrity of Elections Worldwide’, <https://www.kofiannanfoundation.org/electoral-integrity/deepening-democracy-summary/>.

There were diverging views on the role of the UN in addressing the impact of technology on public debate and electoral processes. Concern was voiced about the tendency of multilateral institutions to move slowly and methodically, whereas new technologies and tactics are advancing rapidly. Scepticism was expressed as to whether the international community will make any progress on regulating new technologies, and whether progress was more likely at the national level. However, there was also a view that this is precisely the sort of normative role that the UN could and should play.

2.2.1 ‘In larger freedom’ – recommendations

2.2.1.1 Address ecosystems of misinformation in the digital age

- Build on the work of the High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation to create a more meaningful role for the UN in this space, including:
 - In establishing international norms.
 - Conducting research on the dynamics and impacts of social media on public debate, social cohesion and electoral processes.
 - Convening states, technology companies, civil society and other stakeholders to debate appropriate action to address the political and societal implications of social media.

2.2.1.2 Improve the integrity of elections and democracy in the context of emerging threats

- Improve the integrity of elections by using approaches developed by the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security, for example by:
 - Reducing barriers to democratic political participation by acknowledging the intersectionality of barriers and security challenges.
 - Supporting a mutual security system that does not allow those in power to eliminate their political opponents, and that incentivizes electoral losers to accept the results.⁴

2.2.1.3 Protect and promote human rights

- Encourage states and other stakeholders to adopt a human rights-based approach to implementing all SDGs, and not just the explicit human rights-related targets.
- Encourage states to consider shortening the length of the UN Human Rights Council’s universal periodic review cycle from four to two years, to allow for more consistent examination of human rights in every UN member state.
- Explore ways to strengthen collaboration between UN human rights bodies and mechanisms and other parts of the system. This could include a discussion of the most appropriate locations for these bodies.
- Ensure that the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) receives the support it needs to improve its capacity to create archives on human rights abuses, so that greater possibilities for justice exist in the future.
- Ensure that the UN secretary-general considers establishing and convening councils of right defenders.

⁴ The three other recommendations not listed here were: control political finance; build the rule of law; and use independent, professional and capable election management.

2.3 ‘Cool and reasoned judgment’ – conversation overview

The first day ended with a conversation format session on Kofi Annan’s leadership style and approach to the role of UN secretary-general. A key theme was the attentiveness to listening and understanding that he employed in all relationships, regardless of how politically complex. As highlighted by Nader Mousavizadeh, Annan was uniquely suited to the role of secretary-general due to his ability to convince other leaders that his success was in their interest. He was concerned in negotiations to reduce a lack of understanding between all sides and made great efforts to try to bridge such gaps. He saw military intervention as absolutely the last resort. He also understood that, to be successful, he needed to empower and delegate to his team. Alex Russell recalled that Annan saw his philosophy of leadership as a combination of ‘farming’ and ‘engineering’ – needing the seeds for growth to be planted and structures to be changed where needed.

Kathy Calvin noted that Annan had remained actively engaged with global challenges and crises almost right up to his death in August 2018. His loss was keenly felt among communities and constituencies the world over. Describing his approach, Calvin noted his willingness to work with leaders he disagreed with, while also standing up to them. He had done so in the case of the George W. Bush administration during the ‘war on terror’, and it was an approach that he had continued after leaving the UN. He also understood that changes did not have to be ‘zero sum’. For instance, he had maintained that the rise of China as a global power did not need to come at the expense of others.

2.4 ‘Global market, global values’ – panel overview

The legacy and priorities of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and their successors, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), were the focus of this panel. In her opening remarks, UN Deputy Secretary-General Amina Mohammed provided an overview of the transition from the MDG era to the SDGs, which are broader in ambition and scope and place greater emphasis on partnerships. She also underscored the need to bring the principles of solidarity and universality, which underpinned the UN Charter, to the SDGs.

Despite the challenges highlighted throughout the conference, the deputy secretary-general, and this session as a whole, acknowledged the MDGs as part of Annan’s legacy in supporting advances relating to rising life expectancy, human well-being, declining violent conflict and many other areas. The panel stressed that these are important points to remember when confronting the loss of confidence in institutions. The challenge now is to build on these advances, and the approaches used to achieve them, to deliver concrete action and outcomes, especially through the SDGs. Harnessing the full capacity of the private sector will be key, but political leaders also need to signal that they have heard the alarm and have the ambition to take actions to ensure progress on the SDGs.

Reflecting on the changing context for global development initiatives, Mark Suzman spoke to the core strength and competencies of the UN as a vehicle for driving normative change, despite the challenges presented by power imbalances. The MDGs reflected this normative power, as they profoundly changed the way in which development was understood and prompted a wider set of partnerships among the UN, civil society, philanthropy, the private sector and others.

Focusing on the continent of Africa, as Annan did even more intensively after he had left the UN, Strive Masiyiwa outlined demographic youth ‘bulges’ and unemployment as serious challenges to pursuit of the SDGs. He stated that we need to reimagine how young people are going to operate

and interact in urban populations. There are also important links to be made to energy needs in Africa. Entrepreneurs have got 75 per cent of Africa connected to mobile phone networks faster, more cheaply and more efficiently than any state or development programme could have done. A similar approach could be employed to develop green energy.

Global actors need to look to business partners for opportunities to accelerate progress on global goals, while being aware of the remaining role for the public sector in delivering, for example, unprofitable but necessary services. New approaches to security for banks were raised as key to encouraging lending, especially to small ventures and farmers. Investigating these barriers to entrepreneurship was articulated as a priority for pursuing development and harnessing the capacity and talents of youth.

Entrepreneurs have got 75 per cent of Africa connected to mobile phone networks faster, more cheaply and more efficiently than any state or development programme could have done. A similar approach could be employed to develop green energy.

Addressing one common criticism of the MDGs/SDGs, Claire Melamed set out the benefits of having a quantitative framework that offered clarity: ‘This is what we want, this is how we know we will get there.’ The 169 targets of the SDGs allow for tracking progress if the data are accurate, enabling efforts to hold governments accountable.

Rapidly changing patterns in so many areas have made it difficult to guide advocacy, policy and resourcing decisions at the UN, yet technology means that it is becoming easier to capture these changes. Accurate data can be a source of decision-making, but in order to have value, the data need to be timely and inclusive, reflecting the reality of people’s lives. Three principles for effective ways to measure impact through data were suggested: (1) gather robust data which can evaluate how well tools are delivering; (2) ensure impact is evaluated from the perspective of those who are meant to benefit from the programme; and (3) systematically pool wider data systems in the country in question, for instance from NGOs that are already monitoring impact and from private-sector entities, and integrate these into the policy and accountability structures of government and government systems. It was noted that data can easily be misunderstood, and that for greater accessibility data need to be combined with narratives. Data should not be the sole criteria for informed decision-making – some decisions must be made on moral, political and philosophical grounds.

2.4.1 ‘Global market, global values’ – recommendations

2.4.1.1 Harness the capacity of data

- Increase investment in:
 - Real-time data, especially with regard to the SDG targets.
 - Research on how to improve SDG indicators so that they better reflect the needs and experiences of those receiving interventions.
 - Initiatives to ensure that people typically excluded from data collection do not remain ‘invisible’.
 - Developing the understanding of policymakers and practitioners on what data can and cannot be used for, including in terms of shaping narratives (e.g. messages need to be humanized).

- Leverage data in:
 - Government policymaking, including data that may not support desired narratives.
 - Communications and mechanisms that support transparency and accountability.
 - Early warning for conflict prevention.

2.4.1.2 Make entrepreneurship a priority

- Increase state investment in youth entrepreneurship – this should include financing, training and education (and could be linked to SDG priorities, such as energy needs in Africa), as well as mechanisms to listen to the needs and concerns of young people.
- Explore new tools for security for banks to free up financing for small-scale farmers and ventures.
- Encourage large enterprises to assist smaller ventures through financing, skills development and knowledge transfer.

2.4.1.3 Build (unlikely) partnerships

- Use the SDGs as a rallying point for partnerships even where tensions may exist elsewhere between the actors involved. For example, state–private sector–civil society partnerships are key to improving the quality of data.

2.5 ‘Governance, youth and leadership’ – panel overview

This panel brought together young leaders from civil society to discuss youth engagement in leadership and governance – one of the core themes to emerge from the previous sessions. Introducing the panel, Zeinab Badawi noted that despite obstacles such as shrinking civil society space, young people are organizing creatively in response to pressing challenges and having significant impact – the climate change strikes and debates were highlighted.

Alvin Carpio pointed out that young people are not just leaders of tomorrow, they are leading already but traditional systems have not caught up with that reality yet. He pointed to the discrepancy between how young people engage – in terms of mechanisms, platforms and language – and the engagement opportunities provided by governments and multilateral institutions. Hajer Sharief expressed frustration that ‘we are still talking about the right of people to participate’. She also noted that inspiring leaders in the mould of Kofi Annan now seemed to be in short supply.

Enyseh Teimory pointed to the inherently global mindset of many young people, and their awareness of intersectionality, as well as the interconnected nature of the challenges we face. She also cautioned against speaking about ‘youth’ as a cohesive voice. Mainstreaming any perspective means having different voices at the table. However, doing so relies on confronting the reality of systematic barriers in terms of who can enter this conversation – including race, gender, class, age, religion and other factors.

Natasha Kimani focused her remarks on youth – especially young women – in politics. Badawi asked whether lowering the age for political office, as has been done in Nigeria, could create positive change. Kimani observed that the hurdles were not merely legal but socio-cultural: for example, there was an expectation in some countries that female political leaders needed to be married with children – and endorsed by a male political leader – to succeed. Echoing other panellists, she called for more funding

for youth, given that young people are more educated, skilled and numerous than ever before. This opportunity is not being seized.

2.5.1 ‘Governance, youth and leadership’ – recommendations

2.5.1.1 Consistent, meaningful youth engagement

- Create processes and mechanisms for consistent, ongoing and meaningful participation of diverse youth actors in policy discussions on all issues (not just those deemed youth-specific) at the local, national and international levels.
- Ensure that efforts to build partnerships on the ground include young people, as well as civil society, business, government and UN entities.
- Lift barriers to youth participation in civil society processes, and harness the capacity of youth movements working on human rights, development and security.
- Ensure that national budgets include earmarked investment in young people.
- Seek ways, including through actors who are influential with younger audiences, to improve communications on the UN’s values and goals.

2.6 ‘The fork in the road’ – panel overview

The fifth panel considered what reforms are needed at the UN – and whether they are feasible – given the current geopolitical climate, pressing challenges facing the world, and future trends. Richard Gowan described the UN of today as heavily shaped by reforms from the Annan era, such as the Human Rights Council, Peacebuilding Commission and R2P, though not the Security Council, where Annan put energy into reforms but was unable to overcome differences between states.

Michèle Griffin considered Annan’s achievements in reform as rooted in developing mutual trust towards shared goals of member states. In the absence of this trust, a pattern is established wherein member states demand institutional fixes from the UN for what are ‘fundamentally political problems’ between member states. Either trust must be restored or this pattern must be broken.

Richard Gowan described the UN of today as heavily shaped by reforms from the Annan era, such as the Human Rights Council, Peacebuilding Commission and R2P, though not the Security Council, where Annan put energy into reforms but was unable to overcome differences between states.

Querying the appetite and political climate for reform, David Hannay suggested a sectoral approach might be worth considering, beginning with the climate change summit, for example, and then moving on to arms control and disarmament through the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Arms Trade Treaty. He noted that a number of smaller UN entities and programmes could potentially be consolidated, with work transferring in part to multi-stakeholder partnerships. At the same time, some bodies could benefit from greater human and financial resources – he gave the Peacebuilding Commission as an example. He also struck a note of warning about threats to the World Trade Organization (WTO), and underscored the need to strengthen multilateral cooperation on trade, including the WTO dispute settlement process.

Danny Sriskandarajah noted with regret that the current framework for civic participation in global governance was not fit for purpose, despite the availability of new technologies that enable engagement. At a time when participation and transparency are increasingly on the public agenda, he believed that the UN risked losing relevance and legitimacy if it failed to open up. On technology more generally, he echoed previous sessions’ calls for effective governance through multi-stakeholder frameworks.

Patricia Lewis picked up this theme, noting that this needs to be high on the UN’s agenda. For instance, artificial intelligence offers a way to make sense of big data, which is needed for initiatives such as the SDGs. But the UN also needs to consider issues such as improving the capacity of machines to think more like humans so that their decisions better reflect – even improve on – human decision-making. She also suggested this should not just be confined to development but could be used creatively in conflict prevention.

Panellists suggested that building consensus around issues which already have general agreement, such as the secretary-general’s approach to conflict prevention, could provide an avenue for reform and open up space for non-Western actors to lead.

Panellists reflected on who might drive UN reform. They noted that it is not clear what many middle-income and emerging powers want from the UN in the future, nor do we yet know the impact of the current reforms under way on UN peace and security, management and development structures. Panellists suggested that building consensus around issues which already have general agreement, such as the secretary-general’s approach to conflict prevention, could provide an avenue for reform and open up space for non-Western actors to lead. In the context of shifting global dynamics, panellists commented on the anticipated diminishment in the UK’s influence post-Brexit, and noted that its development assistance budget was an avenue for leadership at the UN.

The session concluded with a discussion on engaging stakeholders and partnerships, noting that UN reform efforts should not only involve states. Support from other actors may help refine the details and priorities for UN action, as well as implementation of agenda items. Curating multi-stakeholder partnerships may also help mitigate the negative effects of declining support for multilateralism.

2.6.1 ‘The fork in the road’ – recommendations

2.6.1.1 Approaches to UN reform

- Concentrate on implementation of current reforms, which represent significant changes to structures and processes at UN headquarters and in the field, and resist pressure to pursue further restructuring. Instead:
 - Revisit previous reform recommendations to analyse proposals that may have been partially implemented or not adopted but could be useful now.
 - Adopt a sectoral approach to reform, focusing on issues to be addressed (e.g. climate, trade, arms control) rather than on structures to be fixed, to overcome long-standing impasses on reforms and avoid institutional tinkering.
- Encourage a review of smaller entities and programmes that could potentially be consolidated, and functions that could be transferred.

2.6.1.2 Practical priorities for UN reform

- Manage expectations around what the UN can achieve, and how, and clearly communicate with stakeholders outside the UN, especially those from civil society, the private sector and academia.
- Enhance mechanisms for civil society participation in global governance, for example by:
 - Considering the creation of a senior UN focal point (e.g. under-secretary-general, or envoy) for civil society.
 - Increasing civil society space within the UN, and encouraging greater action at the national and international levels to protect civil society space elsewhere (including online).
 - Ensuring that civil society is integrated into the work of the UN, in the field and at headquarters.
- Allocate more resources to the Peacebuilding Commission.
- Strengthen the UN’s strategic communications capacity, including but not limited to enhancing and empowering the Department for Global Communications.

2.7 ‘We the peoples’ – conversation overview

The penultimate session was a conversation on Kofi Annan’s ability to engage stakeholders. His ability to communicate with people and world leaders, while reinforcing a clear narrative on what the UN stands for, was critical to his success. He faced significant challenges in communicating that narrative, in light of UN failures in Bosnia and Rwanda, and crises in Iraq, but he managed to strike this balance, and to create a role for the secretary-general as a moral voice. Edward Mortimer noted that Annan’s achievements underscore the importance of having leaders, especially at the UN, who can communicate with the poor and marginalized as well as heads of state.

Kumi Naidoo emphasized Annan’s role in championing human rights, and put this in the context of the current fraught geopolitical environment. He noted that creating the sort of UN and global governance system we need will require more than minor tweaks to the system, and that a more dramatic redesign is implied. Empowering diverse sets of new actors, especially from civil society, will be critical to the UN’s future. In the discussion that followed, it was noted that civil society actors also needed to change – to be more inclusive and effective.

Naidoo warned that civil society, while complementing the delivery capability of governments, is often treated as cheap labour. The kinds of investment and commitments needed to champion multi-stakeholder partnerships require macro-, meso – and micro-level actors. They also need to take into account the differences between these actors, and points of tension, for instance on issues relating to human rights and environmental protection or to approaches such as civil disobedience.

On the role of the relationships with the private sector, Mortimer cautioned against ‘UN blue-washing’, where some businesses that have signed up to the Global Compact fail to fulfil their commitments without consequences. The Compact needs to be able to moderate the behaviour of businesses and encourage them to meaningfully engage in development pursuits. Mortimer cited Annan’s success in bringing pharmaceutical companies together to lower the cost of antiretrovirals – an initiative which took a practical problem, of poverty and disease in developing countries, as a starting point and paved the way for engagement in other areas.

Elizabeth Cousens also raised the role of young people, who could contribute to redesigning governance and making it more inclusive and people-centred. Young people need to be prepared to handle the fallout from challenges in the future, while also seeking to stimulate, influence and support solutions. One practical means of supporting this is to ensure that school curriculums adequately address global challenges such as climate change, and that education and training seek to equip young people for managing these challenges and advocating for solutions.

2.8 Looking forward

The final session of the conference invited the audience to look ahead in practical terms, focusing on priority issues and solutions. Natalie Samarasinghe commented that the present confluence of crises may not represent a ‘fork in the road’, as the title of the session on UN reform implied, but rather a tipping point or point of no return, where we could see irrevocable damage to the rules-based international system. The world was becoming more multipolar but also more polarized, with tangible impacts on multilateral institutions and hard-won international agreements. There was also a growing disconnect between people, governments and institutions as citizens lose faith in the ability of those in power to improve their lives.

Alan Doss highlighted four themes that had emerged from the conference. The first was the durability of the issues that Annan had prioritized: human rights, climate change, equality, Africa and UN reform. The second concerned the key differences between Annan’s time at the helm of the UN and the present day, notably demographic changes (including that Africa will be the most populous region within a generation); economic transformations (primarily the shift towards the east); digital innovations (such as social media); and political transitions arising from globalization and generational change to a more interconnected and urban population.

The third theme was the extent to which Annan’s time as secretary-general had coincided with, and been buoyed by, the so-called golden era of the post-Cold War years, notwithstanding that US obstructionism had also existed then, and that this had required Annan’s skill to overcome it. The fourth theme concerned the guiding principles of Annan’s approach: patience, persistence and participation.

Going forward, the Kofi Annan Foundation, through its Vision Annan programme, would prioritize Annan’s strength as a ‘curator of coalitions’, inspiring partnerships and building capacities for action, and supporting initiatives by young leaders.

During the discussion, the importance of youth engagement was reiterated, with one participant commenting that the generational shift could mark a transition to more instinctively multilateral populations in many countries. The issue of inclusivity was underscored, with proposals relating to a greater role for civil society in UN decision-making and scrutiny, for instance through a ‘shadow General Assembly’ made up of civil society and the public. The benefit of the UN having critical friends, who provided political and financial support but also focused on increasing its effectiveness, was also raised, as was the need for the organization to do more to tackle problems such as sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers and staff.

Looking at next steps, it was noted that Chatham House would be taking forward many of the issues raised during the two days as it geared up to marking its centenary in 2020. Inclusive global governance would be a central theme. Through its global ‘Together First’ coalition, UNA-UK would

be identifying the most feasible, transformative next steps for addressing global catastrophic risks, with a view to producing a civil society agenda for UN renewal to coincide with the UN’s 75th anniversary next year.

Wrapping up the conference, participants highlighted deficits in four major areas of the UN system: principled, far-sighted political leadership; proactive communications that mobilize diverse support; inclusive processes that allow stakeholders to participate in decision-making; and solidarity, as the organization continues to have a Western bias in structure and programming. At this moment, standing up for the values espoused by Annan is necessary – it is difficult to reclaim ground once ceded. Despite – and because of – the challenges facing the world, we cannot shrink our ambition.

Conference Agenda

Day One: Monday 3 June 2019

09:30–10:30 *Registration and coffee*

10:30–10:45 *Welcome*

Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, Patron, UNA-UK; UN Deputy Secretary-General (2006)

Robin Niblett, Director, Chatham House

10:45–12:15 *Panel One | ‘The Arc of Intervention’*

From Bosnia to the Brahimi Report and from Rwanda to the ‘responsibility to protect’ (R2P), Kofi Annan played a significant role in many critical moments that shaped approaches to peacekeeping and the protection of civilians. What has been the impact? Have UN peace operations evolved sufficiently to reflect the changing nature of conflict? How are mechanisms of prevention, protection and accountability such as R2P, Human Rights Up Front and the International Criminal Court currently faring, and what can be done to strengthen them?

Panel: *Lakhdar Brahimi*, The Elders; Chair, Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (2000)

Comfort Ero, Africa Program Director, International Crisis Group

Ian Martin, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General in East Timor (1999), Nepal (2007–09) and Libya (2011–12)

Chair: *Michael Keating*, Executive Director, European Institute of Peace

12:15–13:30 *Lunch*

13:30–15:00 *Panel Two | ‘In Larger Freedom’*

How did Annan see the UN’s role in promoting and protecting human rights? What impact can UN mechanisms and initiatives have in an increasingly challenging political environment for human rights and the rule of law? And with the rise in populist politics, what can we learn from Annan’s work on democratic reform and resilience, including his legacy of the Annan Commission on Elections and Democracy in the Digital Age?

Panel: *Radhika Coomaraswamy*, Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict (2006–12); UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women (1994–2003)

Patrick Gaspard, President, Open Society Foundations

Raila Odinga, High Representative for Infrastructure Development, African Union; Prime Minister of Kenya (2008–13)

Stephen Stedman, Deputy Director, Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law

Chair: *Annika Savill*, Executive Head, United Nations Democracy Fund

15:00–15:30 *Coffee break*

15:30–16:30 *Conversation | ‘Cool and Reasoned Judgment’*

This conversation will provide an opportunity to reflect on how Annan’s personality and values influenced his approach to managing crises, and on the role of the UN secretary-general in crisis management generally. The conversation will also discuss Annan as a mentor.

Participants: *Kathy Calvin*, President and CEO, United Nations Foundation

Nader Mousavizadeh, Co-founder, Macro Advisory Partners

Chair: *Alec Russell*, Editor, *FT Weekend*

18:00–20:00 *‘Kofi Annan: His Life and Legacy’, Central Hall Westminster*

This public event, hosted by UNA-UK, will commemorate Kofi Annan’s life and legacy. Doors will open at 17:00 for a 18:00 start.

Speakers: *Nane Annan*

Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, Patron, UNA-UK; UN Deputy Secretary-General (2006)

Amina Mohammed, UN Deputy Secretary-General

Mary Robinson, Chair of The Elders; UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (1997–2002)

Natalie Samarasinghe, Executive Director, UNA-UK

Sherrie Westin, President of Global Impact and Philanthropy, Sesame Workshop

Kami, HIV-positive Muppet, Takalani Sesame in South Africa

Citizens of the World Choir

Day Two: Tuesday 4 June 2019

09:00–09:30 *Registration and coffee*

09:30–11:00 *Panel Three | ‘Global Market, Global Values’*

Annan saw development as fundamental to human dignity and freedom. What is the legacy of the Millennium Development Goals? What should be the priorities in ensuring maximum impact from the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly in relation to poverty alleviation and food security? How are innovative partnerships between the UN and other actors such as the private sector and local communities helping to drive impact?

Opening remarks

Amina Mohammed, UN Deputy Secretary-General

Panel: *Strive Masiyiwa*, Board Chair, AGRA; CEO, Econet Wireless

Claire Melamed, CEO, Global Partnership for Sustainable Development Data

Mark Suzman, Chief Strategy Officer and President of Global Policy and Advocacy, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

Chair: *Sam Daws*, Director, UN Reform Project, University of Oxford

11:00–12:00 *Panel Four | Governance, Youth and Leadership*

Rapid demographic and technological changes have reinvigorated youth demands for meaningful participation in addressing local and global challenges. From climate change to economic inequality, democracy-building to women’s rights, young people are seeking a voice in setting the agenda and delivering solutions. Yet they lack significant representation in governance structures. What are the barriers to youth engagement? Which global issues most demand youth participation and where has such participation had impact?

This session will begin with a short video featuring Kofi Annan speaking on youth engagement.

Panel: *Alvin Carpio*, Chief Executive, The Fourth Group; Founder, United Citizens

Natasha Kimani, Head of Programmes, Well Told Story; Mo Ibrahim Academy Fellow, Chatham House (2018)

Hajer Sharief, Co-founder, Together We Build It; Young Leader, Extremely Together (a Kofi Annan Foundation initiative)

Enyseh Teimory, Communications Assistant, UNA-UK

Chair: *Zeinab Badawi*, Presenter, BBC Global Questions and HardTalk

12:00–13:00 *Lunch*

13:00–14:30 Panel Five | ‘The Fork in the Road’

With the UN approaching its 75th anniversary at a moment of great geopolitical uncertainty, will Annan’s reforms provide a bedrock for ensuring the organization’s continued legitimacy and effectiveness? Are current reform proposals sufficiently bold given the rise in global actors, shifting power and calls for the democratization of the UN?

Panel: *Michèle Griffin*, Senior Policy Advisor to the UN Secretary-General

David Hannay, Chair, UN All-Party Parliamentary Group; Member, UN Secretary-General’s High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (2003–04)

Patricia Lewis, Research Director, International Security Department, Chatham House

Danny Sriskandarajah, Chief Executive, Oxfam

Chair: *Richard Gowan*, UN Director, International Crisis Group

14:30–15:15 Conversation | ‘We the Peoples’

This conversation will explore Annan’s efforts to make the UN and global governance more inclusive, including partnerships he forged with business actors and civil society. How should the goal of inclusivity be taken forward?

Participants: *Edward Mortimer*, Distinguished Fellow, All Souls College, University of Oxford; Director of Communications, Executive Office of the UN Secretary-General (1998–2006)

Kumi Naidoo, Secretary General, Amnesty International

Chair: *Elizabeth Cousens*, Deputy CEO, United Nations Foundation

15:15–15:45 Looking Forward

Natalie Samarasinghe, Executive Director, UNA-UK

Alan Doss, President, Kofi Annan Foundation

15:45–17:30 Reception

Acknowledgments

The conference report was drafted by Sabrina White, University of Leeds, with input from Fred Carver, Head of Policy UNA-UK, and Natalie Samarasinghe, Executive Director UNA-UK, along with Ruma Mandal, Head, International Law Programme, Chatham House.

The conference was part of an initiative exploring the legacy of Kofi Annan supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Open Society Foundations. The conference benefited from the partnership of the Kofi Annan Foundation, as well as associate partner organizations – The Elders, International Crisis Group, the Mo Ibrahim Foundation and the United Nations Foundation.



Independent thinking since 1920

Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, is a world-leading policy institute based in London. Our mission is to help governments and societies build a sustainably secure, prosperous and just world.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the copyright holder. Please direct all enquiries to the publishers.

Chatham House does not express opinions of its own. The opinions expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the author(s).

Copyright © The Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2019

Cover image: Kofi Annan meets with high-school students in Kabul, Afghanistan, in January 2002.
Copyright © Chien-min Chung/Getty Photos

ISBN: 978 1 78413 371 9

This publication is printed on FSC-certified paper.



Typeset by Soapbox, www.soapbox.co.uk

The Royal Institute of International Affairs
Chatham House
10 St James's Square, London SW1Y 4LE
T +44 (0)20 7957 5700 F +44 (0)20 7957 5710
contact@chathamhouse.org www.chathamhouse.org

Charity Registration Number: 208223