



UN-FORUM

National Model United Nations 2009

*Report of the Participation of Freie Universität Berlin,
representing Australia,
7–11 April 2009, New York*

Freie Universität



Berlin

'Our foreign policy approach is guided by our determination to make a difference as a good international citizen.'

The Hon Stephen Smith MP

Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs at the Annual United Nations Day Dinner, 2008

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF GERMANY
Berlin-Brandenburg Branch

CHAIR

Axel Berg * Prof. Dr Claudia von Braunmühl * Reinhard Führer * Wolf-Rainer Hermel * Prof. Dr Klaus Hüfner * Maybrit Illner * Prof. Dr Eckart Klein * Prof. Dr Philip Kunig * Prof. Dr Kurt Kutzler * Prof. Dr Dieter Lenzen * Wolfgang Lüder * Walter Momper * Dr Gunter Pleuger * Prof. Dr Albrecht Randelzhofer * Prof. Dr Gesine Schwan * Dr Hajo Vergau * Klaus Wowereit

BOARD MEMBERS

Dr Christine Kalb, President * Dr Andreas Köhler, Vice-President * Oliver Friederici, Vice-President * Klaus Strakos, Treasurer
Linda Geßner, Executive Board Member * Lisa Paus, Executive Board Member * Prof. Dr Johannes Varwick, Executive Board Member * Dr Inge Kaul * Prof. Dr Markus Krajewski * Markus Leick * Isabell Nagel * Janka Oertel * David Rinnert

SECRETARIAT

DGVN Berlin-Brandenburg, Am Karlsbad 4-5, 10785 Berlin, Tel. (+4930) 261-91-19 *
Fax: (+4930) 264 54 14 * email: dgvn-bb@dgvn.de

IMPRINT

Publisher: United Nations Association of Germany, Berlin-Brandenburg Branch
Editors: Ferry, Bühring, Philipp Jornitz, Peggy Wittke
Layout: Philipp Jornitz
Photos: Gisela Hirschmann, Philipp Jornitz, Marlene Micha
Print: druckhaus köthen

The different reports reflect the author's opinion, not necessarily the opinion of the publisher.

Charge per copy: 3,00 Euro. Additional copies can be ordered at the Secretariat.

June 2009

Copies: 300

ISBN: 3-927 192-33-3

Information of the Berlin-Brandenburg Branch of the
UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF GERMANY

National Model United Nations 2009

*Report of the Participation of Freie Universität Berlin,
representing Australia,
7–11 April 2009, New York*

published by
Ferry Bühring,
Philipp Jornitz
and
Peggy Wittke

on behalf of the Berlin-Brandenburg Branch of the
United Nations Association of Germany

National Model United Nations 2009

The Delegation of Australia



back row (from left to right):

*Ferry Bühring, Pete Burgess, Philipp Jörnitz, Santiago Gómez Rojas, Paul Schmidt, Isabell Nagel,
Dominik Köhler, Florian Lewerenz, Tadhg Stumpf, Lucas Skupin, Christoph Berkemeier*

front row (from left to right):

*Robert Schmidt, Boris Barth, Nicola Shiels, Suleika Sunken, Kristina Werner, Christina Tahamtan,
Anne Zimmer, Franziska Weil, Miriam Reuschel, Marlene Micha, Gisela Hirschmann, Peggy Wittke*

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	3
Sponsors of the Berlin Delegation at National Model United Nations 2009.....	5
1. The National Model United Nations conference.....	6
2. The Berlin NMUN 2009 Delegation.....	8
3. The Commonwealth of Australia – an Introduction.....	16
3.1. Australia – Facts	16
3.2. The Foreign Policy of Australia	16
4. The Preparation Process in Berlin.....	19
4.1. Our Work in the Task Forces	20
4.2. Special Session of the Security Council on the Responsibility to Protect, 26 November 2008	21
4.3. Emergency Special Session of the Security Council on the Situation in Zimbabwe, 13 December 2008.....	24
4.4. ‘Climate Change’, visit by Mr Semjon Schimanke, 4 February 2009	26
4.5. London International Model United Nations, 13–15 February 2009.....	27
4.6. Fundraising Party, 28 February 2009	28
4.7. Session of the Security Council on Guinea-Bissau and Peacebuilding, 3 March 2009.....	30
4.8. Briefing at the Embassy of Australia, 4 March 2009	31
4.9. Briefings at the Federal Foreign Office, 5 March 2009.....	33
4.10. ‘Negotiation Techniques’, visit by Ms Petra Berndt	34
5. The Study Tour at the UN Headquarters,.....	37
5.1. Briefing on Peacekeeping, Mr Andreas Sugar	39
5.2. Briefing on Refugees, Mr Gonzalo Vargas Llosa	41
5.3. Briefing on the Millennium Development Goals, Mr Donald Lee	43
5.4. Briefing on Peacebuilding, Mr Matti Lehtonen.....	46
5.5. Briefing on the International Atomic Energy Agency, Ms Tracy C. Brown	47
5.6. Briefing on the United Nations Development Fund for Women, Mr Antonie de Jong and Ms Hazel Gooding.....	50
5.7. Briefing on the Responsibility to Protect, Ms Rafaela Fernandes	52
5.8. Briefing on Humanitarian Assistance, Ms Stephanie Bunker	54
5.9. Briefing on Migration, Ms Anke Strauss	55

5.10 Briefing on Terrorism, Mr Mitchell Hsieh	57
5.11. Briefing on the Future of the United Nations, Mr Peter Jackson.....	58
5.12 Visit to the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations, Father Philip J. Bené and Mr Lucas W. Swanepoel.....	61
5.13 Visit to the Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations, Mr Roland Tricot.....	63
5.14 Visit to the Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations, Ms Fleur Davies and Mr Andrew Rose.....	65
6. Australia at the NMUN 2009 conference, 7–11 April 2009	67
6.1. Australia in the General Assembly Plenary.....	68
6.2. Australia in the General Assembly First Committee.....	70
6.3. Australia in the General Assembly Second Committee	72
6.4. Australia in the General Assembly Third Committee	74
6.5. Australia in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.....	77
6.6. Australia in Commission on Sustainable Development	78
6.7. Australia in the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	82
6.8. Australia in the Food and Agriculture Organization Council.....	84
6.9. Australia in the United Nations Development Fund for Women	85
6.10. Australia in the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Executive Committee	87
6.11. Australia in the World Trade Organization.....	89

Foreword

This year, *Freie Universität Berlin* participated in the *National Model United Nations* conference in New York for the fourteenth time. Having represented Japan last year, our Delegation laid its focus on the Asian-Pacific region once again by impersonating diplomats of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Conceived by many as a good place to spend one's holidays, Australia might be often overlooked when it comes to international politics. Indeed, the country is a regional hub, and an important partner for a range of issues. It is the major country to take immigrants from the Pacific Island Countries, a question that will be of paramount importance with a further aggravation of the climate change we are facing today. It is estimated that several Pacific Islands will even disappear due to a rising sea level, bringing up the challenge – not least from the perspective of international law – of the so-called climate change-induced migration, i.e. moving entire populations from one country to another. As a matter of fact, the current Australian Government of Prime Minister Rudd is particularly active regarding international attempts to reverse the effects of climate change. One of its first actions after coming into office was to ratify the *Kyoto Protocol*. The government is also eager to put forward an agenda for reducing carbon dioxide emissions, especially by implementing new technologies that are won by intensive research. An example for this can be seen in the carbon capture and storage technology.

Adopting the conception of Australia as a 'good international citizen', twenty students of several departments of *Freie Universität Berlin*, as well as of *Humboldt Universität, Technische Universität* and *Universität Potsdam*, took on the challenge of incorporating the ideas and policies of the largest Oceanian country in the outcome documents of the *National Model United Nations* conference. Students of Law, Political Science, Economics, Administration Sciences, North American Studies, Chinese Studies as well as Physics from different countries, such as Germany, Spain, Scotland and Ireland, connected and became the Delegation of Australia in the semester-long preparation course and the ensuing Study Tour at the *United Nations Headquarters* in New York. At the conference, they could finally apply their knowledge on Australia, the *United Nations* and the workings of international diplomacy that was acquired in class.

A major factor of the preparation is our ever-growing network with the diplomatic community in Berlin. An invaluable part of the preparation of our Delegation was the visit to the *Australian Embassy* in Berlin, and I am very grateful to Mr Chester Cunningham for giving the students so many insights into Australia's foreign policy. These insights were enhanced by Ms Fleur Davies and Mr Andrew Rose at the *Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations* in New York, who engaged in lively discussions with the students on many details, and I warmly thank them. Furthermore, it has become traditional to pay a visit to the *Federal Foreign Office* to broaden the often very country-specific preparation by looking at the German point of view. In this regard, I owe gratitude to Mr Mirko Schilbach, who presented the work of a Permanent Mission to the United Nations and the working methods of the *United Nations* to our students from the standpoint of a practitioner, and to Mr Bertram Jooß, who rounded up the students' knowledge on Aus-

tralia's bilateral relations. At this point, I also wish to warmly thank Mr Achim Gaier, for his engagement in organising our visit at the Foreign Office.

I am also very appreciative of the support Mr Roland Tricot of the *Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations* in New York conveyed to us by explaining to our students the work of the European institutions at the *United Nations*. Moreover, I wish to thank Father Philip Bené and Mr Lucas Swanepoel of the *Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See* for their intriguing briefing on the role the Holy See plays at the United Nations. The briefings our Delegation received at the *United Nations* were, as in the previous years, organised by Mrs Swati Ratovonarivo to whom I owe deep gratitude.

I am very appreciative as well of the team that conducted the preparation, accompanied our Delegation to the conference and organised the project behind the scenes: Mr Ferry Bühring, Mr Philipp Jornitz and Ms Peggy Wittke. Further, I wish to thank Ms Petra Berndt for introducing our students to the art of negotiating. Also, I am grateful that Mr Semjon Schimanke of the chair of Professor Dr Ulrich Cubasch at *Freie Universität Berlin* made the consequences of climate change clear to our Delegation.

Finally, I owe gratitude to the *German Academic Exchange Service* (DAAD) and the *Robert-Bosch-Stiftung* without whose financial support the *National Model United Nations* project would not be possible to realise.

Prof. Dr Philip Kunig

Sponsors of the Berlin Delegation at National Model United Nations 2009

We thank the following persons, companies and institutions for their financial and/or academic support:

German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)

Robert-Bosch-Stiftung GmbH

Ernst Reuter Association of Friends, Supporters and Alumni of the Freie Universität,
Model United Nations Chapter

United Nations Association of Germany, Berlin-Brandenburg Branch

Fleur Davies, Counsellor at the Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations,
New York

Andrew Rose, First Secretary at the Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations,
New York

Chester Cunningham, Second Secretary at the Australian Embassy in Berlin

Swati Ratovonariwo, United Nations Department of Public Information, New York

Roland Tricot, Counsellor at the Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations,
New York

Father Philip Bené, Attaché at the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations,
New York

Lucas Swanepoel, Attaché at the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations,
New York

Mirko Schilbach, Federal Foreign Office

Bertram Jooß, Federal Foreign Office

Achim Gaier, Federal Foreign Office

Petra Berndt, Mediator, Consultant, Coach

Semjon Schimanke, Institute of Meteorology, Freie Universität Berlin

Dr Wedigo de Vivanco, International Affairs Division, Freie Universität Berlin

Andrea Adam, German University Alliance, New York

Dagmar Haake, Department of Law, Freie Universität Berlin

Marco Matthäi, Lufthansa City Center, Berlin

Borries v. Deimling, VCF Berlin

Genevieve Libonati

1. The National Model United Nations conference

The *National Model United Nations* (NMUN) was founded in 1946 as a successor to the *Model League of Nations* which originated in 1923. These programmes are directed at students to offer thorough and detailed information on the *United Nations* system and the work and function of international organisations by means of an authentic simulation. The popularity of the *Model United Nations* programme has risen constantly over the years. Meanwhile, these programmes are also being offered at high schools – in the United States more than 200,000 high school and college students take part in the simulations annually. The great acceptance of *Model United Nations* is not limited to the United States: today *Model United Nations* take place in more than 25 countries throughout the world including Germany. *Freie Universität Berlin* organises, together with different co-operation partners like the *Federal Foreign Office* and the *United Nations Association of Germany*, various *Model United Nations* conferences throughout the year in Berlin.

The *National Model United Nations* today is the largest simulation of the *United Nations* in the world. Each year more than 4,000 students from North America, Latin America, Asia, Africa and Europe take part in the conference, which is held for five days at the Marriott Marquis Hotel or the Sheraton Hotel & Towers, New York, and the *United Nations Headquarters*. The *National Model United Nations* is sponsored by the *National Collegiate Conference Association*, a non-profit organisation, which works closely with the *United Nations* and was granted the consultative status by the Economic and Social Council in 1995. The Board of Directors co-ordinates and supervises the simulation. The conference is administered by a 55-member Secretariat which is composed of graduate and undergraduate students who are elected annually. Head of the Secretariat is the Secretary-General, supported by a Director-General and a Chief of Staff.

Each participating university represents a *United Nations* Member State or non-governmental organisation at the conference. According to reality, these Member States and non-governmental organisations are represented in different committees and international organisations. It is the task of the delegations to make themselves acquainted with the history and policy of their country or non-governmental organisation in order to act as realistic as possible at the conference. In addition, it is necessary to lay down the position concerning the different topics that will be negotiated during the sessions. The visit at the *Permanent Mission to the United Nations* offers the valuable opportunity to gather first-hand background information by consulting high-ranking diplomats.

During the five days of the conference, the delegates of the various committees strive to work out proposals and draft resolutions. At that point it becomes clear that the knowledge, which has to be obtained, cannot be limited to the country or non-governmental organisation represented, but has to include information on ‘friends and foes’ as well, in order to get into contact with the proper partners during negotiations. The participating students are expected to behave as active diplomats, who have to formulate their positions and try to enforce them, but at the same time have to be open-minded towards compromises, always taking into consideration the special interests of the represented nation or non-governmental organisation. This marks one of the major attractions of the *National Model United Nations* conference: each Delegate has to participate in the negotiations by ensuring that his nation’s/non-governmental organisation’s interests are taken

into account. By the reaction of the other delegates, he immediately realises his failures and, most importantly, his success.

At the end of the conference, the voting procedures take place at the *United Nations Headquarters*. Selected resolutions are on the floor of the General Assembly *Plenary* and the Economic and Social Council. The passing resolutions are forwarded to the Secretary-General of the *United Nations*, Mr Ban Ki-moon, as the official result of the *National Model United Nations*.

Peggy Wittke



Ferry Bühring



Peggy Wittke



Philipp Jornitz

Faculty Advisors of the NMUN 2009 Delegation

2. The Berlin NMUN 2009 Delegation

The Delegation of Freie Universität-Berlin met for the first time in October 2008. The diversity of the group was immediately apparent. Students had been selected from various different academic backgrounds, ranging from Law to Physics and a number of nationalities were also represented within the group. While the majority of the 21 delegates including one substitute were German, there were also delegates from Ireland, Scotland and Spain. The ages of delegates also varied, with some delegates embarking on their very first semester in higher education, while others were 30-year-old veterans. Experience in Model United Nations conferences also varied, again with some delegates having taken part in a number of meetings in the past while others had no experience at all.

The group did, however, share a common goal to find out more about international economics, law and politics and gain a greater appreciation of not just the *United Nations* itself, but of the global issues which are of concern to all nations.

It became quickly apparent that NMUN would become more than just an additional academic project, but instead a very unique personal experience. Working together as a team, we got to know each other very well and also began to get to grips with some of the vast issues which we were dealing with. Australia, the country we would represent in New York, was the focus of many of our discussions as we strived to put ourselves in their shoes, and study in depth themes that, while receiving very little notice in Europe, are of utmost importance in the Asia Pacific region.

We prepared for the conference in various ways throughout the first and into the second semester, and these have been recorded later in this publication. The three faculty advisors gave great instruction to the Delegation, both in teaching new concepts and also in instructing our independent research which came to a head in finalising the position papers, a two page document in which each committee must outline its background, purposes and intentions regarding the issues under consideration in the upcoming conference.

The project was worth every minute we invested. The experience to see the *United Nations Headquarters* in New York and the tangible results at the conference played a part. But of greater importance was the way in which the work and the process itself changed our understanding of the issues we discussed and gave us another small push towards ultimately attaining that balanced, thankful and compassionate way of seeing the world that we should all strive for.

Pete Burgess



Boris Barth, born in 1986, studying History and French, could experience international co-operation on the EU-level during his academic exchange year at *Brussels' Free University* in 2007/08. Especially as an intern with the *Association of German Banks* in summer 2008, he gained great interest in the functioning of Brussels' network of interest groups. Through his participation in NMUN 2009, he broadened his mind on the possibilities of ensuring peace, safety and wealth throughout the world. Besides, meeting cosmopolitans from all over the world at NMUN and working with them was one of the programme's greatest appeals to him.

At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the *Food and Agriculture Organization Council*.

Christoph Berkemeier, born in 1980, studies Physics at *Technische Universität Berlin*. He has always been interested in politics, as it predates history. He considers the hard work in preparing for NMUN 2009 was worth the fun and the experience. Especially since he learned a lot of things natural scientist are not used to.

During NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the *Commission on Sustainable Development* together with Paul Schmidt.



Pete Burgess was born in 1988 in Perth, Scotland. Since 2006, he studies Law in Glasgow. While becoming a representative and later the treasurer of the University's *Law Society*, and getting involved in a local church and a number of other activities, Pete travelled to the US during his summers to work with the *Southwestern Company*. He has spent around 8 months running his own sales business and recruiting, selecting and training fellow students. In October 2008, he moved to Berlin to spend a year studying abroad, where he became involved in the Model United Nations.

At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the General Assembly *Plenary* together with Dominik Köhler. He was Head Delegate of the FU Delegation.

Santiago Gómez Rojas, born in 1978, studies Political and Public Administration Sciences at *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*. He went to Berlin for two years to continue his studies. His special field of interest is International Relations. Participating in the NMUN programme gave him the opportunity to better understand the work and commitments of an international organisation, where many important decisions are taken and influence the destiny of states and peoples. It also helped improving his abilities of communication in diplomatic negotiations, in order to conciliate different interests and to agree compromises to achieve common goals. At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the General Assembly *Third Committee* together with Christina Tahamtan.



Gisela Hirschmann, born in 1985, is studying Political Science at *Freie Universität Berlin*. The NMUN conference was the first MUN she participated in, although she gained some simulation experience at the conflict simulation on Somalia at the *Otto-Suhr-Institut* in 2007. From 2007–2008, she studied abroad at *Duke University* in the US. She was working as a intern for the *United Nations Development Programme* in Benin in the summer of 2007. She took part in NMUN 2009 to deepen her knowledge of the UN and to experience debates on global challenges from different national and cultural perspectives.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the *UNHCR Executive Committee* together with Marlene Micha.

Dominik Köhler, born in 1987, studies Political Science, Administration and Economics at *Universität Potsdam*. By participating in the NMUN programme, he could gain practical experience concerning international diplomacy next to the theoretical basis he got at university. A special appeal of this programme to him was the opportunity to work together with other students and have a look behind the scenes of the *United Nations*.

At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the General Assembly *Plenary* together with Pete Burgess.





Florian Lewerenz, born in 1984, studies Political Science. He grew up and went to school in Bonn. After his graduation, he passed his civil service in a development project in Nicaragua, where he worked as a teacher in environmental and circus education. Back in Bonn, he started his studies but soon moved to Berlin. His special field of interest in his studies are International Relations with a regional focus on Latin America. From 2007 to 2008, Florian studied a year in Grenoble, France. Besides, he worked as an intern in the German Parliament and in the *Peace Research Institute* Frankfurt.

At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the General Assembly *First Committee* together with Kristina Werner.

Marlene Micha was born on 19 June 1985. After studying political science at *Freie Universität Berlin* for one year and getting interested in the field of human rights upon working at the student group of *Amnesty International*, she changed her major in 2005 to Law at *Humboldt Universität zu Berlin*. At the HU, she also attended a two-year course in American Law. In 2007/08 she did an exchange year at *University College Dublin*, Ireland, where her main focus of studies was Public International and Human Rights Law. She is currently finishing her Law specialisation at the HU in Public International and European Union Law.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the *UNHCR Executive Committee* together with Gisela Hirschmann.



Isabell Nagel was born on 6 October 1987 in Hamburg and is currently pursuing a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science at *Freie Universität Berlin*. During her high school years, she spent one year abroad at the *Meridian High School* in Michigan, US, and did an internship at a hotel in Caudry, France. After finishing high school in 2007, she joined the *UNI-Gruppe*, which she became the president of in 2008. Always having been interested in politics and especially world issues and the UN. NMUN 2009 appealed to her especially because of her interest in the diplomatic process and the detailed preparation.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the General Assembly *Second Committee* together with Miriam Reuschel.

Miriam Reuschel was born on 23 May 1986 in Berlin. After receiving her high school diploma she started studying Economics at the *Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel*, she now completes her studies at *Freie Universität Berlin*. Her major fields of interest are development economics and the importance of good governance for developing countries. Due to this, Miriam decided to participate at NMUN 2009 in order to learn more about the international work of the *United Nations* and its organs.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the General Assembly *Second Committee* together with Isabell Nagel.



Paul Schmidt, born in 1987, learned about and with different cultures and nationalities right from the start. Throughout his life he was always eager to further this knowledge and grasped every chance to learn new languages, travel, or to spend a high school year in the US in 2004. He is currently studying North American Studies and Chinese Studies at *Freie Universität Berlin*. He participated in the NMUN because he wanted to get to know a different field of study, but also because he thought this would be an interesting project and that the diplomatic milieu would be something worth looking into.

At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the *Commission on Sustainable Development* together with Christoph Berke-

meier.

Robert Schmidt, born in 1988, studies Political Science at *Freie Universität Berlin*. Being strongly interested in foreign affairs, the NMUN programme constitutes a special occasion to deepen his knowledge and understanding of processes in international politics, especially when connected to the *United Nations*. For him, it is most essential to develop a high level of understanding of its past and present, interests and positions to be able to represent a country as correct as possible. This and keeping diplomatic formalities at the conference is the major personal gain of the NMUN conference.

At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the *Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific* together with Franziska Weil.





Nicola Shiels was born in 1984. She studied Law with German at the *University of Glasgow* and spent an Erasmus year at *Freie Universität*. Her studies concentrated on Public International Law. After university, she participated in the 3rd *United Nations World Youth Congress*, which is when her interest in the UN really crystallised. Following a two-year traineeship in a law firm and at the *Scottish Government*, she qualified as a solicitor in Scotland. She then returned to Berlin to undertake a Master's degree in Law. At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the *United Nations Development Fund for Women*.

Lucas Skupin was born in 1986. He studies Political Science and Sociology at *Universität Potsdam*. He took part in the Model European Union in 2008 at *Freie Universität Berlin*. Taking part in the NMUN programme was a tremendous way of further educating himself in the fields of international relations and debating next to many issues that make this programme a fruitful experience. At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the *Commission on Narcotic Drugs* together with Tadhg Stumpf.



Tadhg Peadar Stumpf was born on 24 March 1989 in Berlin. From 1997 to 1999 he lived in Zambia, where his father worked in Development Aid as a doctor for the *German Development Service (DED)*. During high school, he spent a year abroad in Dublin in 2005 where he stayed at a guest family. In high school he participated in several projects focusing on politics. After finishing high school in Blomberg in 2008, he started studying Law at *Freie Universität Berlin*. At NMUN 2009, he represented Australia at the *Commission on Narcotic Drugs* together with Lucas Skupin. He was Head Delegate of the FU-Delegation.

Sannya Suleika Suntken was born on 18 July 1985 in Berlin. She has lived in Greece, Croatia and the US and after having completed a apprenticeship as a foreign language correspondence clerk at the *Friedrich-List-Wirtschaftsfachschule* in Berlin, she currently studies Bachelor of Economics in her 4th semester at *Freie Universität Berlin*. The NMUN experience not only provided an insight in to the work of the UN but also diplomatic techniques and methods of finding solutions to the many challenges our world faces today.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the *World Trade Organization* together with Anne Zimmer.



Christina Tahamtan, born in 1987, studies French and German Law at *Universität Potsdam*. For two years, she regularly attends Model United Nations conferences. For her, it is always a great experience to participate in these conferences, since one has the opportunity to discuss various important topics on an international scale. Especially the fact that students from all over the world were part of the NMUN conference appealed to her. Participating in this programme positively influenced miscellaneous abilities like finding consensus within a large group of different opinions or broadening one's horizon due to representing another country.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the General Assembly *Third Committee* together with Santiago Gómez Rojas.

Franziska Weil was born on 9 May 1988 in Düsseldorf, where she also went to school. From 2004 to 2005, she participated in an exchange programme and went to *Takapuna Grammar School* in Auckland, New Zealand. This was certainly one of the most valuable and influencing experiences she has made so far. In 2007 she graduated from High School and moved to Berlin to study Political Sciences at *Freie Universität Berlin*.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the *Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific* together with Robert Schmidt.





Kristina Werner was born in Berlin on 10 May 1980. After her Abitur, she went to the US to work as an Au pair for one year. When she came back, she started studying Education and Psychology in Augsburg and at *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität* Munich. After her graduation, she went to Australia, taking part in a work & travel programme. After six months, she decided to return to Berlin and study law. Meanwhile, she is in her 4th term and has set her focus on International Law.

At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the General Assembly *First Committee* together with Florian Lewerenz

Anne Zimmer, born on 24 April 1985, studies Economics at *Freie Universität* since this field of studies seemed to combine best her various interests in politics, science, maths, as well as cultural and behavioural theory and languages. Having passed one wonderful semester in Lausanne, Switzerland, she got in touch with various international organisations located 'next door' in Geneva. Intending to work in an international organisation after having finished her studies, she very much appreciated the NMUN programme to deliver insight into the complex processes of such organisations as well as gaining a different perspective by getting in touch with other fields of studies like politics, history and law. At NMUN 2009, she represented Australia at the *World Trade Organization* together with Suleika Suntken.



3. The Commonwealth of Australia – an Introduction

3.1. Australia – Facts

Area: 7,703,581 sq km
Population: 20,743,000
Religions: 64 per cent Christian, 2 per cent Buddhist, 2 per cent Muslim
Languages: English (official), Chinese, Italian, Greek
Capital: Canberra
Head of State: HM Queen Elisabeth II. (represented by Governor-General HE Ms Quentin Bryce AC)
Head of Government: The Hon Prime Minister Kevin Rudd
GDP: US\$ 945,674 million (2007)
GDP per capita: US\$ 45,590 (2007)
Human Development Index: 0.962 (3 rd rank)
Member of the <i>United Nations</i> since 1 November 1945

Sources: *United Nations, UN Data, Australia*,
<http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=Australia>; Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, *Australia in brief: A diverse people*,
<http://www.dfat.gov.au/aib/society.html>; UNDP, *Human Development Report 2007/2008*,
http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_20072008_EN_Complete.pdf; websites last visited on 4 June 2009.

3.2. The Foreign Policy of Australia

Australia's foreign policy identity has a very distinct character: historically, the country was tied to the 'West', while geographically, it constitutes a major power in the Asian-Pacific region. The country's three main pillars of foreign policy reflect this: they are the partnership with the United States, the regional focus on Asia-Pacific and multilateralism within the *United Nations* as the primary strategy.

After the terrorist attacks in New York on September 11 and then in Bali, the fight against terrorism became the top priority in Australia's foreign and security policy. The country offers capacity-building support to countries of the region (Indonesia, Philippines, among others), and entertains 13 bilateral counter-terrorism Memoranda of Understanding with various countries.

Australia is furthermore committed to countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The country is the permanent chair of the *Australia Group*, which is dedicated to preventing the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons through the harmonisation of export controls.

With regard to military operations, the Rudd government started to withdraw Australian troops from Iraq in 2008 although Australia remains committed to maintaining its engagement in Afghanistan. The government announced a further AU\$ 250 million in development assistance for Afghanistan at the *International Afghanistan Support Conference* in Paris in June 2008. The main geographical focus of Australia's (military) operations lies in the Middle East and the Pacific.

Australia's primary goals regarding aid policy are to fight poverty and to implement the Millennium Development Goals. To reach this objective, Australia delivered AU\$ 3,155.3 million official development assistance (ODA) in 2007/08 (0.30 per cent of the GNI in 2006). This places the country at a medium range, with the average *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development* effort being at 0.45 per cent although the Rudd government has pledged to increase Australia's ODA to 0.5 per cent of the GNI by 2015. Australian aid flows mainly to the Asian-Pacific region. The second recipient bloc is African countries. Besides bilateral aid programmes, Australia commits over 25 per cent of the aid programme to multilateral organisations like the *United Nations*, the *World Bank* or the *Asian Development Bank*.

Australia pursues multilateral, regional and bilateral strategies to open new markets, reduce barriers to trade and promote Australian goods and services. The country's primary goal is financial stability. With regard to the financial crisis, the Rudd government stresses the role of the *International Monetary Fund* and *G-20* as important global institutions. The government also is committed to concluding the *World Trade Organization* (WTO) *Doha Round* in the near future. Besides its bilateral Free-Trade Agreements within the framework of the WTO, the country is especially active in the *Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation* (APEC). Thus, trade liberalisation constitutes Australia's primary economic goal, while shifting the economic strategy from bilateralism to more multilateralism under the new Rudd government.



Climate change has become a top priority. The country, which was already active in the *Asian-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate* under the former government, finally ratified the *Kyoto Protocol* in March 2008 and placed climate change on the agenda for APEC for the first time. In addition, the country advocates the creation of a *South Pacific Whale Sanctuary* to enhance whale conservation and initiated and supported efforts of the *United Nations* General Assembly to reach international agreements on fisheries for marine conservation and management. Since the 2004 tsunami in the

region, Australia has been very active in developing and implementing effective warning mechanisms to better protect countries in the region.

Australia is currently the 13th largest contributor to the UN, in total accounting for US\$ 141.2 million of the UN's total budget in 2006–07. The country is campaigning for a non-permanent Membership in the Security Council for 2013–2014.

Australia is an isolated country geographically but by no means is this the case politically, socially or culturally. Because of historical ties, a common language and shared cultural elements, Australia enjoys close ties with the United Kingdom, Canada and the US. In part due to geography and in part due to their shared heritage, Australia and New Zealand also share a close relationship. Australia, Canada and New Zealand often co-operate closely at the *United Nations*: CANZ is the abbreviation for the group of these three nations, whose representatives often prepare statements to present on behalf of all three countries.

Australia works with European countries on a bilateral basis as well as with the *European Union* as a collective entity. A *Australia-European Union Partnership Framework* was adopted in October 2008; the agreement deals mainly with foreign policy, terrorism, international trade and recognition of Asia-Pacific. It is important for Australia to work closely with the *European Union* not only because of similar cultural roots but also because, after all, the EU is a major source of imports for the country and the various countries work together in the *Western European and Others Group* (WEOG) at the *United Nations*.

Finally, in the Asia-Pacific region Australia is becoming increasingly active. Australia is a Member of the APEC and also of the *Pacific Island Forum*, which is an inter-governmental organisation dealing with aid and development issues. More recently, Kevin Rudd appointed a Parliamentary Secretary for Pacific Island Affairs.

It is likely that Australia will become more involved in Asia, both in terms of trade and in development. Australia is already a Member of various Asian regional organisations and maintains relationships mainly based on trade with China, Australia and India on an individual basis, as well as supporting, through development aid, poorer countries in the region. It remains clear, however, that Australia will also strive to maintain existing relationships with the UK, New Zealand, US, Canada and the *European Union*. Thus, Australia's foreign policy will continue to be shaped by its double-identity as a Western and an Asian-Pacific country.

Gisela Hirschmann and Nicola Shiels

4. The Preparation Process in Berlin

The biggest part of our *National Model United Nations* (NMUN) programme is always done in Berlin. The final goal is of course the big NMUN conference in New York, and while that might be the only reason for some to participate, it is not the only thing that needs to be done. Long before the conference actually takes place, i.e. about a semester before, we started our thorough and extensive preparation process.

The whole application process can be counted as part of the preparation already. Part of it was an interview with our faculty advisors, which also included a small MUN conference/discussion with some of the other soon-to-be delegates and some applicants who eventually did not make it. Those who did make it, and decided to actually do it soon met regularly twice a week. Our very first meeting as a whole Delegation was on Thursday, 30 October 2008 and from then on we met on Wednesdays and Thursdays, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

In the first few weeks we learned about the UN system. We talked about the *UN Charter*, its specific focuses like peace and security, disarmament etc., but we also dealt with a lot of organisational issues connected to the NMUN. There was the framework of taskforces to cope with the numerous organisational issues that were coming up, such as fundraising, taking care of the website, conference management and documentation. Everyone had to sign up for at least one taskforce.



As soon as we found out that we were going to represent Australia, we started to prepare accordingly. Several delegates gave presentations on Australia's history, politics, economy, and society. We also started to work in the different committees. Once we were teamed up with another delegate we started to work on our committee overviews and after that

on our position papers that were to be sent to New York.

During the semester there were several additional opportunities to prepare for the conference in New York. Something we all participated in were two FU Emergency Sessions of the Security Council in which we took the roles of the Council Members to discuss certain issues. Other opportunities were the *London International Model United Nations*, the

Hertie School of Governance Model United Nations or a MUN organised by *Freie Universität* in co-operation with the *Federal Foreign Office*.

As we got closer to the actual NMUN in New York, when we were all already fairly well-prepared, we participated in a Study Tour in Berlin with several briefings. We went to the German *Federal Foreign Office* and talked to experts on the UN and Australia in order to learn more about both the diplomatic milieu and Australia in an international context. We also visited the *Australian Embassy* in Berlin, where we had a fruitful discussion and gained some interesting insights.

Another important aspect of the NMUN preparation was of course speech and negotiation training. For this, we mainly used our regular meetings. Whenever we had some time left after class, after we gave presentations on our committees, or even spent entire sessions just for practicing and improving our speech and negotiation skills. We also had an expert on negotiating techniques to come to our class and explain the importance of negotiation, and to help us practice it.

All this preparation seemed overwhelming at times, but there was also an aspect of fun in it. The intense and extensive work we did for the NMUN really did prepare us well, and helped us to connect as a group. The things that we learned will certainly be useful to us, especially for those who want to pursue a career in the field of international organisations. And in New York at the latest we all internalised what had been repeated so often during the semester: '*We are Australia!*'

Paul Schmidt

4.1. Our Work in the Task Forces

To ensure the success of our NMUN project, we not only studied the policies of Australia and the procedures of the UN, but also focused on the organisational part of the programme. Therefore, we worked in different taskforces to ensure a perfect preparation and organisation of the project. Students were able to get involved in at least one of the taskforces, which were each monitored by a faculty advisor.

The *Fundraising Taskforce* was further divided into two groups. One of them focussed on the content of a sponsoring letter and then contacted large companies asking for sponsorship. The second group engaged in the organisation of a fundraising party. While we were not very lucky in gaining any major private sponsors, the fundraising party raised some money and provided a good opportunity for us to come together as a group and to get to know each other. Thanks to the efforts of Lucas, we found a great location in the centre of Berlin and had lots of fun taking turns collecting the entrance fee, managing the wardrobe, and of course taking the dance floor.

The *Conference Management Taskforce* was responsible for the preparation of the UN Study Tour and the NMUN conference in New York. Many things had to be kept in mind to ensure that while in New York everything would run smoothly. First of all, the taskforce designed our logo, which shows the Australian flag in shape of the country, surrounded by the laurels of the UN and a tiny kangaroo on the left. We placed the logo on t-shirts, polo shirts and also on our business cards, which we distributed within our com-

mittees during the conference. Furthermore, we bought coffee mugs with our logo and little peaces of the Berlin Wall as presents for the speakers at the UN Study Tour. After the logistic masterpiece of transporting all presents to New York, distributed among various suitcases, our hosts received their gifts properly and in one piece. Overall, the organisational part of the UN Study Tour and the NMUN conference was very successful thanks to the efforts of our taskforce.

The *Homepage Taskforce* naturally took care of the homepage. Its main work consisted of updating and upgrading the homepage from last year's NMUN group. The 'old news' from last year had to be put into the archive while the 'new news' had to be uploaded and presented in a nice way to show the progress of our work, important upcoming events, and of course all the fun we had in our preparation e.g. at the Christmas party. There is also a little picture-profile of each delegate on the website. Like in the other taskforces the opinion and the input from the entire Delegation was crucial for the *Homepage Taskforce*. Important issues such as the inclusion or exclusion of the possibility of viewing the site in French were discussed in the whole group, while other things were handled by the taskforce alone.

There is a reason why the *Documentation Taskforce* comes last in this list of taskforces because while the work of the other taskforces was done by the time of the conference, the *Documentation Taskforce* still had to work hard even after the conference to bring you this wonderful FU-Berlin NMUN report, which brings together all the little reports written by all participants. The taskforce was always present whenever there was something worth photographing in order to have pictures for the report as well as for the website.

The taskforces met regularly, or whenever there was work to be done, before and/or after class to talk about the necessary activities and decisions. Apart from that there was always contact through e-mail. Every once in a while they briefed the whole group on their progress and put important decisions up for a vote or discussion. Within the process the taskforces could always rely on the help and advice of the faculty advisers Ferry, Peggy, or Philipp which was helpful indeed and much appreciated.

Paul Schmidt and Kristina Werner

4.2. Special Session of the Security Council on the Responsibility to Protect, 26 November 2008

The 2005 World Summit adopted a resolution containing a general outline of the new concept of 'Responsibility to Protect' (R2P). R2P is an emerging international principle, which is aimed at providing legal grounds for international action in crisis situations, which are within the domestic affairs of a state. The principle is aimed at protecting those who suffer when a state fails to protect and support its citizens, because it is unable or unwilling to do so. The argument is that state sovereignty entails a R2P towards citizens of a state that shifts from the state to the international community if the state cannot fulfil its duties in cases of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. It is a very controversial subject as there is a great difference in the understanding of this

principle and the concern that the principles of non-use of force (Art. 2 (4) *UN Charter*) and non-intervention in domestic affairs (Art. 2 (7) *UN Charter*) are essentially overthrown by this approach. Therefore, the subject for the Special Session of the Security Council was very well-chosen.

On the conference day, each delegation consisted of one student and one Iraqi diplomat who together represented the delegation of a country in Security Council. These Iraqi diplomats were taking part in a foreign diplomats training held by the German *Federal Foreign Office*.

There were two preparatory meetings at the *Foreign Office* in order to get familiar with the rules of procedure and get introduced to the topic of 'Responsibility to Protect'.

In the first meeting, Ms Peggy Wittke gave us an introduction to the concept of the Responsibility to Protect, highlighting its usage, but also its roots and possible development. Then, we were acquainted with our colleagues, the Iraqi diplomats, and were told which country we were to represent.

In the following weeks, a lot of research had to be done and each delegation had to prepare a position paper for its country, which was then handed to the other delegations so that these could get an impression of what would expect them at this conference.



During the second preparatory meeting, Ms Wittke made us familiar with the rules of procedure governing the sessions of the Security Council. Afterwards, we held a Security Council discussion on a resolution sponsored by the 'Republic of Lagerfeld' which aimed at improving all fashion affairs underlining the importance fashion has for the international community

– and supposing that a change of outfit for the countries' delegations might be a great improvement – if every country were to wear clothes in the colour of their countries' flags. The discussion was very emotional, full of passion and it was obvious that this highly controversial subject shook the roots of many countries' beliefs.

On 26 November, it was finally time for the 'Special Session of the Security Council on the Responsibility to Protect', which took place at the Senatssaal of *Freie Universität Berlin*.

After the presence of all fifteen delegations was checked by our chair Peggy Wittke, each delegation had the opportunity to give a two-minutes opening speech, in which they stated their country's position.

After we were given the provisional agenda, the actual discussions began. By proposing to include certain issues, the delegations highlighted their countries' priorities towards the issue. Discussing the agenda lasted almost one hour, which showed that there were many different proposals as to how to approach the topic and controversial views about how solutions can be found. We then agreed on splitting the agenda into six parts, of which the only two parts we got to discuss were: 1. Definition of the Responsibility to Protect and 2. Prevention and reaction measures.

While discussing the first agenda topic, the definition of the R2P, it became clear that although there were strong supporters of the concept such as France, South Africa and the United Kingdom, there was also a strong opposition bloc headed by Russia and China.

During long and detailed informal consultations, we learned how challenging the work of the Security Council actually is, since it nearly took us two hours to decide on two draft resolutions concerning a definition.

The first one was introduced by China, the US, South Africa, Italy and France. It essentially confirmed the R2P as it was laid down in the *World Summit Outcome Document*. Nevertheless, it failed due to the lacking support of Russia and the UK as Permanent Members using their veto right though for very different reasons. Russia was blocking the resolution, because it did not support the R2P concept in general and the UK was hoping to pass its own draft resolution that went further than the Chinese draft. Together with France, Belgium, Costa Rica and Croatia, the United Kingdom introduced a draft resolution. This resolution emphasised the main ideas of R2P, namely: *prevention* of possible internal conflicts, *reaction* to those conflicts with sanctions or, in extreme cases, even military interventions and *assistance* in rebuilding processes. Moreover, the UK draft also highlighted the importance of peacekeeping operations as a tool of actually achieving the protection of endangered citizens.

Although having the support of ten countries in total, thus passing the required threshold of nine, the resolution failed due to the vetoes of three of the five Permanent Members (P5), the US, Russia and China.

Before the second agenda item was discussed, we had a short lunch break, in which a lot of delegations continued to hold informal caucuses. They were really helpful, not only in order to discussing ideas with delegations that could possibly support these, but also to approach other delegations, who did not share the same views, and therefore trying find consensus among all the delegations as far as possible.

When finally formal discussions started again, the prevention and reaction measures of the R2P concept were at the centre of attention.

Viet Nam, the US, Panama and South Africa introduced a resolution stating clearly that military force as an option had to be the last resort and that regional operations had to be preferred. Though they managed to gather an enormous amount of support, the resolution

eventually failed due to the Russian veto, which led to China not openly disagreeing with the resolution but rather abstaining. Thus with Russia and Croatia opposing the resolution, China abstaining, the other 12 concurring votes could still not bring the resolution into force.

Though this outcome was rather disappointing for all of us, it must be said that it is rather realistic that the actual Security Council would have been unable to reach consensus on this matter as well due to the Council's controversial legal status and practical implications.

Nonetheless, the session was an enriching experience due to which we had the chance to improve our negotiating and speaking skills and test our abilities concerning the rules of procedure. Moreover, we got acquainted with real diplomats who were not only able and willing to give us an insight on their point of view on the session's topic but also on other interesting events in international politics (especially in Iraq) during the delegation dinner after the session hosted by the *Foreign Office*.

All of this was very helpful for the conference in New York, so we are most thankful to the *Foreign Office* and *Freie Universität* for giving us this very unique and exciting opportunity.

Marlene Micha, Tadhg Stumpf and Christina Tahamtan

4.3. Emergency Special Session of the Security Council on the Situation in Zimbabwe, 13 December 2008

The Delegation of *Freie Universität* Berlin met on the 13 December 2008 for a simulation of an Emergency Session of the UN Security Council, representing its 15 Members.

A – fictive – letter dated 12 December 2008 from the Secretary General was presented to the Security Council, along with an attached letter from David Miliband, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom. The letter informed the Secretary-General on the situation in Zimbabwe. The economy was still crumbling and inflation was rising sharply every day. By the end of December, an estimated 5 million Zimbabweans would depend on food aid. Moreover, the cholera epidemic was reaching an unprecedented scale, having claimed 775 persons to that point. The UN had reported 16,000 cases already and some estimates reached as far as 60,000. In response to fleeing Zimbabweans, South Africa had declared some of the areas neighbouring Zimbabwe disaster zones adding an international dimension to the crisis.

The British Government was providing £10 million in humanitarian aid to the region, but the Zimbabwean Government led by President Robert Mugabe had rejected the assistance claiming there was no cholera in Zimbabwe. The British Government called for the will of the people of Zimbabwe to be restored and immediate measures to be taken.

The Emergency Session began at 10 a.m. and following the setting and the adoption of the agenda, the Council moved on to the substantive issues. Each of the 15 countries represented gave an opening speech, which ranged in scope and emphasis. The United

Kingdom, along with countries such as the United States and France called for immediate action to relieve the suffering in the region in light of the unwillingness and incapacity of the Zimbabwean Government to do so itself and also the international dimension of the situation.

Other countries, China and South Africa being perhaps the most vocal, voiced their fears that rushed intervention may not only be in contravention to international law, but may also send out a dangerous message and result in a precedent which could erode state sovereignty.

The first few informal caucuses gave nations the chance to find working partners and align themselves with other like-minded countries pursuing similar objectives. The European nations formed a substantial bloc, attracting a few other Members. It was clear to all delegations from the beginning that the concerns held by China, and to a lesser extent Russia, would have to be considered and worked with, given the veto power that the two nations possessed in the Security Council. To be passed by the Council, any possible resolution had to at least earn abstentions from the Permanent Members, but better still their support.

At lunch, the delegations had the opportunity to discuss further the content of any possible working papers. After the break, the emphasis was very much on making material progress; several working papers emerged with proposals including imposing economic and trade sanctions on Zimbabwe, providing immediate humanitarian aid, the organisation of free and fair elections in the country (the nation was still struggling to conclude an effective power sharing agreement between the two parties following the elections in September 2008) and the respect for human rights.

Working through frustration, several working papers began to merge forming what would be the draft resolutions which were put to vote in the final minutes of the Emergency Session. Proposals to organise elections within Zimbabwe failed, deemed by many countries, including South Africa and Burkina Faso, to be too intrusive and an infringement against the sovereignty of the state. Phrases such as ‘international peace and security’ and references to Chapter VII of the *Charter* were also rejected, with some Members fearing an imbalance to the delicate theme of the Responsibility to Protect and Humanitarian Intervention in light of state sovereignty.

The final resolutions which were successful called for an increase in aid and called upon the government of Zimbabwe to accept humanitarian assistance in light of the worsening situation, while recognising the principles of state sovereignty.

The simulation was enjoyed by all the delegates, and for those delegates for whom it was the first simulation of its kind, it proved an invaluable experience in preparation for the final conference in New York.

Pete Burgess

4.4. 'Climate Change', visit by Mr Semjon Schimanke, 4 February 2009

With climate change being one of the most pressing challenges of our time and the discussion about its consequences being omnipresent in politics and the media, the 2009 Delegation of *Freie Universität Berlin* was not only looking forward to the briefing concerning this topic because climate change is a top priority for Australia but also because of its importance for us today as global citizens. We had the pleasure of being introduced to this topic from a scientific perspective by Dipl.-Met. Semjon Schimanke of the Institute of Meteorology at FU Berlin. His informative briefing was focused on the work and findings of the *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (IPCC) and provided us with valuable insights into the scientific process of climate modelling and predicting the consequences of climate change.

The IPCC was founded by the *World Meteorological Organization* and the *United Nations Environment Programme* (UNEP) in 1988 with the purpose of evaluating the consequences of man-made climate change and come up with internationally binding and accepted scientific assessments taking into account the progress of research worldwide. The latest findings were published in 2007 in its *Fourth Assessment Report*.

Echoing the findings of over 1,000 authors from over 130 countries for over a period of six years, this comprehensive piece of work clearly states that climate change is man-made and that the global mean temperature is rising. Relying on complex data sets which examine an investigation period from 1850 to 2005, the report demonstrates that global mean temperature rises since 1900 0.07 °C per decade. Over the last 50 years the observed trend amplified to a level of 0.12 °C per decade. Also alarming are the constantly rising sea levels, who according to the IPCC's *Fourth Assessment Report* have already risen around 20 cm due to anthropogenic climate change. But the consequences don't stop here. Drastic changes can also be observed for example in the areas of rainfall, permafrost soil, and sea ice cover. Surprisingly enough the data doesn't support reports linking an increase in tornados, lightings, or the disappearance of the Antarctic Ice Coverage to climate change.

When talking about climate change and global warming, it is essential to look at the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere since they are proven to be responsible for global warming. While some argue that the high temperature today can be explained by its natural variability, the data of the *Fourth Assessment Report* clearly shows by reconstructing CO₂ emissions for the last 400,000 years that today's peak in greenhouse gas emissions is unprecedented and is definitely not a natural occurrence. Just taking a look at the levels of the last 100 years and the never before seen rise during such a relatively short period of time, one cannot deny the unique situation we face today.

Besides merely introducing us to the findings of the IPCC, Mr Schimanke also put an emphasis on explaining to us the scientific process behind the often discussed climate scenarios and models included in the *Fourth Assessment Report*. Although climate models have vastly improved in complexity and quality over the last 30 years, it is important to keep in mind that they are models and are currently not able to take into account all relevant processes especially due to lacking state-of-the-art computer performance. Nevertheless models have made huge advancements and the processes they feature today,

such as clouds, ice, oceans, volcanoes, aerosols, and chemical processes, are plenty and complex.

The four main scenarios included in the Report, A1, A2, B1, and B2, are in turn based upon different scenarios regarding global energy production (economy v. ecology-oriented) and different ways of approaching the challenge of climate change (regional v. global). Alarming, all of these four scenarios predict a further rise in global temperature, even if emissions would be completely stopped. The predicted rises in temperature until the end of the century range from 1.1 °C to 6.4 °C. Beside temperature changes a number of additional things are suspected: rainfall will decline in the southern Europe, while it will increase for the northern Europe; sea ice coverage will drastically decline, and chances for hot and record hot weather will go up. In the European context, these changes will lead to higher risks for heat waves, forest fires, but also for floods and spring tides due to the rise in sea levels and storms. Furthermore less snow and a decline in glacial ice will lead to a decrease in winter tourism and the extinction of many species living in the glacial mountain ranges. In Southern Europe we can expect drier and hotter summers, who in turn will also cause a decline in tourism and water availability and will make poor crops a frequent occurrence.

Ending his briefing with the thought provoking statement that the emissions examined today are way higher than those used in all the models, Mr Schimanke's briefing definitely left us with a lot more insight into the topic, but also lots of ideas to consider.

Isabell Nagel

4.5. London International Model United Nations, 13–15 February 2009

Knowing that being a good diplomat requires a lot of practice, a small group of delegates from our Delegation decided to put their negotiating skills and rhetorical abilities to the test already early on in the year, when we took part in the *London International Model United Nations* (LIMUN). This famous and extremely well-orchestrated MUN is organised yearly by students based at various universities in London and takes place at the campus of *King's College London*. This year LIMUN celebrated its 10th anniversary, which in our eyes was certainly obvious because everyone worked really hard and tried to make the MUN a truly memorable experience for all of us delegates.

Luckily for us, we got to represent Australia and New Zealand, so we could test our acquired knowledge with NMUN in New York already in mind. The range of topics covered in the committees was really wide and included: Abuse and Misconduct by UN Peacekeeping Personnel, the Global Food Security Crisis, and Developing a Permanent *United Nations* Military Intervention Force. The final topic in particular led to some heated discussions concerning state sovereignty, political will and the concept of the Responsibility to Protect. After some tough negotiations, Australia and its close allies such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Israel and, surprisingly, Colombia, was ultimately able to hand in a draft resolution calling for a small, rapidly-deployable UN force of 2,500 members, which would serve as a test run for further future actions concerning permanent UN forces. Australia particularly contributed to the wording on spe-

cial training and capacity building programmes for these forces while also being an important advocate for this draft when it came to selling it to the Asian countries. When on the last day of the conference this resolution passed, we couldn't believe what we had actually achieved!

Besides the formal sessions LIMUN also offers a lot of chances to socialise and get to know other delegates outside of 'negotiating mode' while getting to know the thrilling London night life. One of the highlights surely was the 10th Anniversary Ball. Especially the location of the Anniversary Ball was really breathtaking and left us all in awe when we got there since it was held on *The London Regalia*, an old-fashioned boat on the Thames.

LIMUN really offered us a lot of valuable experiences, especially for first-time participants in a MUN, and after having gone through the process of negotiating until your head starts spinning, living on caffeine for a long weekend, and having met people from all over the world, every single one of us truly felt ready for New York and the NMUN experience.

Isabell Nagel

4.6. Fundraising Party, 28 February 2009

In order to finance our project and raise money, we were encouraged by the faculty advisors to have a party.

Since we heard from the positive experiences of former Delegations, we decided that it would be also of great use for us. Not only because we would raise money, but also because it was the best occasion to socialise among us; especially with many of our acquaintances and friends. It was an opportunity to tell them and show them more of our project.

The *Fundraising Task Force* began hence to look for a place where we could give a party for at least 250 people. We were 20 people within the Delegation and we estimated and agreed that every one of us should succeed to bring at least between five to eight people. With 100 people we would cover the expenses.

We were enthusiastic about the idea, but we had to face the first inconveniences by December. Some of the ideal clubs we requested were not available for the dates we wanted to give our party, and while waiting for the answer of other clubs, we did not agree on any alternative date, nor sign a contract with the formers until we had received an answer from the latter. Others just gave us a denial or the conditions from others were just not favourable for us. While negotiating, time was running. But we did not want to give up so easily. We were determined to have our party because we still had time.

By mid-February we had finally an agreement with a club. We decided to give the party on 28 February, even when we were conscious that we were almost at the end of the term and that many people were supposed to study for the exams or would have little time because they had to write their papers. We were determined to have our party and were

also very optimistic because as a team we had already an objective and a compromise: our party with friends.

Lucas had succeeded to have a good deal with *VCF Club* in Berlin-Mitte, and now the hardest work was to invite everyone to our event a week before it took place. That was no problem, because we also used Facebook by creating a group, in order to let know more people about it.

‘Habemus convivium, we have party, tenemos fiesta!’ We now had to organise us and distribute the duties during the party. As we had an agreement with the owner of the club, Borries v. Deimling, we did not have to think about the drinks. The drinks should be served by him and our benefit should be the entrance and the cloakroom. In that way we could have enough time to have fun and to take care of our guests.

Then, we had two posts or two duties that should be covered at least by two people: the cashier at the entrance and the person in charge of the cloakroom. We calculated that from the opening until closing, at least two people should be an hour in each position, which meant four people per shift, from 11 p.m. to 4 a.m. But the party lasted until 5:30 a.m. and everyone enjoyed until the last minute the music was played.

We had great music from 4 DJs that played free of charge for us, so that our party may be attractive and open for anyone who was passing by. It was not completely a private party and we invited and encouraged people to come in when they realised that something was going on in that club.

The influx of people was not as much as we expected, but taking into account the little time we had to prepare the party and to communicate it, it was definitely a tremendous success. We did not earn much money, but at least we had enough to cover all costs; what meant at the end that we did not have any loss.

On the contrary we had a great time together in a very nice place. We met new people who were also taking part in the conference in New York through other universities and organisations, e.g. people from *Universität Potsdam* or people from the DGVN Delegation, and also curious people that spontaneously found the club and came in.

Santiago Gómez Rojas



4.7. Session of the Security Council on Guinea-Bissau and Peacebuilding, 3 March 2009

As simulations are especially important to prepare for NMUN in order to get acquainted with the rules of procedure and resolution writing, another Session of the Security Council was conducted at Henry-Ford-Bau of *Freie Universität Berlin* on 3 March 2009.

This time, 'Peacebuilding' was on the agenda. Peacebuilding should be differentiated from Peacekeeping. Peacekeeping is focused on keeping parties to a conflict apart or to establish a protected area for the civilian population. In contrast to this, peacebuilding mission are more focused on post-conflict situations. The attention lies here on topics like demobilising soldiers, helping victims of war, re-establishing infrastructure and fostering democratic structures, all in all building a sustainable peace. As a preventive measure, it is also applied to pre-war situations to stop instable states to fall into chaos. The *Peacebuilding Commission* helps organise peacebuilding operations.

As some delegates were ill, the seats of Japan, Turkey and Viet Nam remained empty, our job at the Council table got a little harder because you need nine votes in favour of your resolution, even when three delegations are missing. Thanks to a visiting delegation of *Universität Potsdam*, at least Viet Nam could join our session. Before we could make any opening speeches, we had to decide on the agenda. At the outset of our conference, we had received a fictitious letter by the Secretary-General drawing attention on the situation in Guinea-Bissau: Just the day before our session, the President of Guinea-Bissau, João Bernardo Vieira, was assassinated, which was seen as act of revenge for the death of General Batista Tagme Na Waie, the head of the joint chiefs of staff, on the Sunday before. Both men were known to be bitter enemies. Guinea-Bissau was and is a country, which is in the focus of the international community for its political instability. Guinea-Bissau has a long history of internal armed conflict since becoming independent from Portugal in the 1970s. The Security Council therefore decided to handle this issue prior to peacebuilding in general. In our two minute opening speeches, each country underlined its position towards this topic. Important positions were the co-operation with the African Union, mentioning the drug trafficking and the stabilisation of Guinea-Bissau. Two fractions of the Security Council submitted a draft resolution. Both were similar in intention, but different in usage of words. As even a single word can lead to a veto by a Permanent Member, and thus block a resolution, we had to further negotiate. Our declared aim was not only to achieve a majority on a resolution, but to achieve a big majority. A big majority would be seen as a clear signal to the people of Guinea-Bissau, that the international community takes an interest in their case. Mostly in informal caucus the Security Council prepared a third resolution, on which everyone could agree on. After the first and the second draft resolutions were withdrawn, all present Members voted in favour of the third draft resolution. The clear signal of hope we had aimed for.

On the second agenda topic – Peacebuilding – we did not see big differences, either. Similar to the first topic, the inclusion of regional actors was important to some Members. The efficiency of the *Peacebuilding Commission* was discussed. The opinions on the creation of standby-forces were diverse, but we could bridge the gap in informal caucus. As before, the two opposing groups agreed on a third draft resolution. The present Members of Security Council voted unanimously in favour of the draft resolution.

This resolution establishes for example a *Working Group on Procedural Methods of the UN Peacebuilding Commission* to improve its effectiveness.

Of course we decided to remain actively seized of the matter and were quite happy to have reached agreement on these topics.

Christoph Berkemeier

4.8. Briefing at the Embassy of Australia, 4 March 2009

On 4 March 2009 our Delegation had the pleasure of being the guests of the *Australian Embassy* in Berlin. We were welcomed most kindly by our speaker, Mr Chester Cunningham, who is the Second Secretary at the Embassy with a thematic focus on climate change. Though the topic of his speech was ‘Australia, Germany and the European Union (EU)’, Mr Cunningham offered to answer questions about the *United Nations* (UN) as well, as he had worked at the *Permanent Mission of Australia to the UN* in the past.



Firstly, Mr Cunningham outlined general facts about Australia, which was a good consolidation of what we had already learned through our own research. Nonetheless, we learned some interesting new facts as well. For instance regarding the 1999 referendum on replacing the Queen as Head of State and thereby transforming Australia into a republic. Though the referendum eventually failed, Mr Cun-

ningham said that at that time approximately 80 per cent of the Australian population felt the need to grant the position of the Head of State to an actual Australian. Despite this general support for a republic, Australians could not agree on the model for a Head of State. We learned about the work at the embassy in general. On the one hand, the embassy's work centred on projecting a good image of Australia; on the other it also encompasses providing Australians with passport and consular services.

Mr Cunningham then described the Australian relationship with the *European Union* in detail. For Australians, the close bond stems from their European roots. Approximately 70 per cent of the population is of European descent. The EU as a bloc in the 2007–08 was even Australia's largest partner in trade with the prominent exception of agriculture.

On his 2008 visit to the *European Commission*, Prime Minister Rudd lay down the foundations for the so-called *Australia-European Union Framework*, based on the responsibilities under the third pillar of Australia's foreign policy (strengthening its co-operation

with international institutions). The *Framework* essentially promotes strong ties between these two actors in, for instance, the commitment to multilateral institutions such as the UN; shared economic interests e.g. concluding the *Doha Round* and enhancing trade between the EU and Australia. Moreover, the Framework encompasses a plan to coordinate actions in the Asia-Pacific region regarding development assistance. In fact, Australia is a valuable partner concerning in the Asia-Pacific region as it has good contacts and can act as 'hub' for the region and major contact for the EU.

Mr Cunningham then moved forward to the topic of the German-Australian relationship. Examples of common topics that tie those two together are: social security, counter-terrorism and climate change. Moreover, Germany and Australia have close business relations. The construction sector in Australia apparently is dominated by Germans. Moreover, through student and 'work and travel' visas 16,000 Germans per year have the chance to experience Australia first-hand. This is done according to the motto: 'If you've been to Australia, you become a friend of it'.

After finishing his presentation, Mr Cunningham gave us the chance to ask UN-related questions asking each of us about the topics we would be discussing in New York. When asked about Australia's seemingly ambiguous position on the topic of nuclear proliferation – promoting rigorous non-proliferation on the one hand and actively exporting uranium on the other – Mr Cunningham answered that Australia only exported uranium to countries that it has bilateral agreements with, ensuring that this uranium is only used for civil purposes.

Furthermore, Mr Cunningham answered a question regarding Australia's commitment to engage in the climate change debate since 80 per cent of electricity used in Australia stems from coal. He assured us that Australia actively engages in fighting the effects of climate change for instance by investing in a Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme that encompasses for example measures such as Carbon Capture and Storage.

The last question concerned indigenous people and their role in the Australian society. 2.5 per cent of the population are of indigenous heritage: nonetheless, it was not until 1928 that the Australian Government formally recognised that the indigenous people were the first people in Australia. Today, the situation of indigenous people is alarming. They die approximately 17 years younger than other Australians. The Australian Government in 2008 issued a formal apology to the indigenous people for the so-called 'Stolen Generation', where – under government policy lasting up to the 1970s – indigenous children were taken from their families and brought to missionary camps aiming at 'civilising' them. Mr Cunningham said that people were moved to tears by this apology as Australia was finally coming to terms with its 'history of guilt'.

The visit to the *Embassy* was very helpful in preparing us for the conference in New York as we were able to get inside information on various topics of Australian policy. We therefore thank wholeheartedly Mr Cunningham and the *Australian Embassy* for giving us this opportunity.

Marlene Micha

4.9. Briefings at the Federal Foreign Office, 5 March 2009

On 5 March 2009, we visited the *Federal Foreign Office* in Berlin, where we had the opportunity to listen to two foreign service officers. Mr Mirko Schilbach from the UN Security Council Division and Mr Bertram Jooß from the Southeast Asia Division. Mr Schilbach focused his briefing on the working methods and negotiation procedures at the *United Nations* (UN), whilst Mr Jooß spoke about the foreign policy of Australia.

Mr Schilbach started with a general outline of the work and structure of the UN. He then emphasised the importance of consensus-building in UN fora, which usually reflects on document drafting at a very early stage. It is highly risky to hope for a majority in particular in the General Assembly when positions of major players or groups within the UN have not been heard or considered before. In this context he also spoke about the importance of regional groups for debate. Mr Schilbach also pointed to the important role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) for the UN. Also, several regional organisations have a observer status and play an important role in politics. He pointed out that it is necessary to get in touch with NGOs and international organisations at the UN and to hear their points of view as they have a big influence not only the national but also the international level. There are also several other groups, such as the well-known *G-77* but also the EU who have a major say in consensus building. He therefore stressed the importance of 'networking', because it is necessary to keep in contact with other Member States in these forums as a lot of important issues are discussed behind the scenes, often during coffee or lunch break.

He then gave us an idea of the day-to-day work of the German Delegation to the UN.

The schedule starts at 8.30 a.m. at the *Permanent Mission*, where the 'inbox', the e-mails and instructions from Berlin, are to be checked and considered. Around 9 a.m. on some days European countries meet in order to co-ordinate their position on pending issues in the UN. At 10 a.m. plenary consultations and 'informals' usually take place. 'Informals' are discussions on important issues that are not open to the public, which due to its unofficial character makes debate more flexible. At 1 p.m., during lunch time, bilateral meetings and perhaps further co-ordination meetings are held. The rest of day is again characterised by informals and reporting on daily events or sessions to Berlin.

After having given us this very interesting insight into the work of the German Delegation at the UN, Mr Schilbach's presentation focused on the practical matters as for example text work. He told us more about the work in the Committees, again stressing the importance of 'consensus-building' instead of mere confrontation. He then outlined the usage of 'brackets' and 'agreed language'. In cases where no consensus can be reached, phrases in draft resolutions are set in brackets, meaning that issues are to be discussed at a different time. This is done to advance the debate. Moreover, there is a frequent use of 'agreed language'. This means that phrases from resolutions that have already been passed by UN fora earlier are re-integrated into new resolutions to reaffirm their meaning and to make consensus building or finding easier.

After the first part of the presentation, Mr Schilbach opened the floor to questions. Our questions strongly focused on the UN Reform, especially with regard to the Security Council. While discussing Germany's proposal for Security Council reform, Mr Schil-

bach outlined the current situation at the UN and the motives behind Germany's interest to adapt the composition and working methods of the Council.

The second briefing was held by Mr Bertram Jooß, who focused on Australia's interests in the Asia-Pacific region and the EU as well as bilateral relations.

He started out by introducing us to the German diplomatic and consular representation in Australia. He then described Australia's foreign policy and highlighted its overwhelming interest in regional political stability in the Asia-Pacific region. He also pointed out Australia's growing engagement in Asia as Australia does not see itself as being merely connected to Europe through its roots and values but also wants to develop its relations with Asia in view of its geographical location.

Mr Jooß described Australia's regional commitment and main partners, always underlining Australia's interests. One example is China, now Australia's most important trading partner. Negotiations are currently under way to establish a bilateral Free Trade Agreement similar to the one already existing with New Zealand. Australia seems to be an ideal supplier of natural resources to China. Large numbers of tourists from China visit Australia every year, many Chinese students study at Australian universities. Australian Prime Minister Rudd used to work for the Australian Embassy in Beijing and is fluent in Mandarin.

Mr Jooß stressed the importance of Australia as a regional anchor of stability within the Asia-Pacific region. Australia supports efforts of further regional integration and provides valuable assistance to countries in the region e.g. the '*Regional Assistance Mission for the Solomon Islands (RAMSI)*'.

Concerning the relations between Australia and the EU, Mr Jooß highlighted the *Australia-EU Partnership Framework*, as well as an agreement on the exchange of Passenger Name Records (PNR).

All in all, this preparatory meeting at the German Federal Foreign Office was a very interesting and definitely a helpful part of our preparation. It gave us an insight to the work at the UN and provided us with working methods we could use at the conference in New York. Moreover, it supplied us with a very concise outline of Australia's key policies together with its importance to and interests in the Asia-Pacific region.

Tadhg Stumpf

4.10. 'Negotiation Techniques', visit by Ms Petra Berndt

In order to negotiate successfully during the NMUN conference, our faculty advisors scheduled a meeting with Petra Berndt for us. Ms Berndt who is a successful negotiation coach, spent two hours teaching us the most important principles to convince our negotiation partners, including the Harvard and the Win-Win Models. Ms Berndt is working as a mediator, negotiation coach and holds a diploma in engineering. Thus she has also provided assistance to many construction projects, including the Paul-Löbe-Haus and the Dorotheenblöcke.

Probably the most important lesson to be learned from this session regarding the Win-Win Model was: 'We are all winners!' This is to say that not only we ourselves will attempt to win something out of the negotiations, but that in return we should grant our partners the same feeling. Specifically, the aim of undertaking negotiations should be that both partners are able to gain at least parts of what they want to achieve. Yet to do so, parties need to act co-operatively and try to find a solution that compromises both parties' needs and wants in an agreeable outcome. Still, one important precondition to be able to act co-operatively is the fact that all negotiators should know their specific goals and be willing to give up some of their aims in exchange for benefits and consensus. Fortunately, due to the extensive research that was undertaken by the delegates preceding the conference, our goals were well defined. Yet, some other important aspects needed to be considered as well.

In general, only three outcomes of negotiations are possible. The first would be what has just been described. In that case both parties would benefit from the situation. Another outcome that may not be very likely would be that only one party benefits from the negotiations. Yet most times one can assume that the other party would rather prefer the last outcome, which would mean that neither party wins. Only in situation where one party is able to apply big pressure on the other, a win-lose outcome may be achieved. However, regarding the fact that one often wants to maintain good relations with his or her trade or business partners, a win-win outcome seems like the most desirable solution.

In any case, according to Ms Berndt, one skill that we must use is our intercultural communication competence to tear apart the 'wall of positions', meaning that by interacting sensitively and respecting our partner's position, we can turn strict and complex positions into smaller aims that are easier to compromise. Afterwards it will be much easier for the parties to find consensus on issues instead of contrasting their different positions. Ms Berndt highlighted cultural differences regarding negotiation processes in other cultures, e.g. the Arab world, where negotiations usually take more time than in the Western World. A basis of trust needs to be established before real negotiations can take place and individuals who don't respect this convention are often understood as rude or not trustworthy. In order for us not to step into cultural and strategic traps Ms Brandt further told us about the Harvard Model.

The main assumption regarding the Harvard Model tells us to separate the people from the problem. Negotiations should always be undertaken on a neutral basis, not taking into account personal sympathies and especially antipathies. Even though a certain basis of



trust and comfort should be established, one must not forget his or her goals or give up more than possible only to please a very sympathetic negotiation partner. In return, also negotiation partners that we would not like to go out for dinner with on a free night, may offer some valuable deals and should thus not be dismissed due to the fact that we do simply not like them that much.

Fortunately, broader consensus will dominate many topics that will be discussed in our committees. But what if we aim to achieve more concrete or maybe raise uncomfortable questions? In this case, the key is to remain calm and secure, without offending others. Rather, differences need to be understood and similarities highlighted to demonstrate possible solutions. Arguing aggressively against our negotiation partners will only provoke much more unco-operativeness on later issues. Criticism should be carefully wrapped into phrases that also highlight the other parties' positive developments in a specific field. At all times a delegate should be clear about what he or she wants to achieve with his or her criticism and offer partners a viable solution that does not disgrace him in front of his own people and their interests.

Now we can only hope that we will be able to follow all or at least many of Ms Berndt's advices and that this behaviour will help us to support many of Australia's interests in all fields. But in any case, all of us will have taken home something from this session and use it either for the conference or for other future negotiations. Despite our excitement about participating in the conference, NMUN may only be a step on our way towards future engagements in this field. Thus, what we learn during the preparation as well as the actual conference is most likely to assist us in the future. If we manage to do so, as Ms Berndt said, we will all be winners.

Franziska Weil

5. The Study Tour at the UN Headquarters,

Before attending the actual NMUN conference, we had the chance to attend a Study Tour at the *United Nations Headquarters*. This tour was organised by our faculty advisors in co-operation with the *United Nations Department of Public Information* (UNDPI). Thus, we were able to enjoy briefings on various topics that ranged from the work of the UN agencies like UNHCR and UNIFEM up to interesting discussions on terrorism, peace-keeping, peacebuilding and a lecture by the Chief Editor of the *UN Yearbook*, Mr Peter Jackson, on the very difficult question where the UN is heading.

These briefings were an excellent preparation for the conference, because we met actual UN officials that deal with the issues that we would later on discuss at NMUN. It was very rewarding on the one hand because we used the information that we gained during our preparation time in Berlin and on the other hand plainly exciting to get first-hand information by diplomats on how the UN works.

Moreover, we were joined at the Study Tour by two other delegations: *Universität Potsdam* and *Universität Lüneburg*. These were very nice encounters as we got to know how these delegations prepared themselves for the simulation and what their expectations for NMUN were.

Upon finishing the briefings at the *United Nations*, our Study Tour was far from being over. We had the honour of being guests to the Permanent Mission of the European Commission to the *United Nations*. This briefing gave us an idea on how difficult it is to co-ordinate the views of the *Western European and Others Group* (WEOG, which Australia is a part of) and more specifically the ones of the 27 EU Member States. Nonetheless, if this effort is indeed successful, it is an influential tool in making change at the UN possible.

On the last day of the Study Tour we attended a briefing at the *Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations*. Instead of giving us a lecture, the two representatives gave us the chance to ask all kinds of questions regarding Australia's foreign policy and more particularly its work at the UN. We could not have asked for a better opportunity to get insight information on all our very specific topics.

The Study Tour was an integral part of our trip to New York and of incredible value to our preparation for NMUN. We are very grateful to Swati Ratovonarivo, our contact at UNDP, Peggy Wittke, Ferry Bühring and Philipp Jornitz, our faculty advisors, for putting so much effort into organising this Tour and for letting us explore all the facets of the work of the *United Nations*.

Marlene Micha

United Nations Study Tour Programme

<p><i>2 April 2009</i></p> <p>10.00 a.m. – 11.30 a.m. 11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m. 12.30 p.m. – 02.30 p.m. 02.45 p.m. – 03.45 p.m. 03.45 p.m. – 04.45 p.m.</p>	<p>Peacekeeping – <i>Mr Andreas Sugar</i> Refugees – <i>Mr Gonzalo Vargas Llosa</i> Lunch Break Millennium Development Goals – <i>Mr Donald Lee</i> Peacebuilding – <i>Mr Matti Lehtonen</i></p>
<p><i>3 April 2009</i></p> <p>10.15 a.m. – 11.15 a.m. 11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m. 12.30 p.m. – 02.30 p.m. 02.45 p.m. – 03.45 p.m. 03.45 p.m. – 04.45 p.m.</p>	<p>UN Guided Tour IAEA – <i>Ms Tracy C. Brown</i> Lunch Break UNIFEM – <i>Mr Antonie de Jong and Ms Hazel Gooding</i> Responsibility to Protect – <i>Ms Rafaela Fernandes</i></p>
<p><i>6 April 2009</i></p> <p>10.00 a.m. – 11.30 a.m. 11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m. 12.30 p.m. – 02.30 p.m. 02.45 p.m. – 03.45 p.m. 03.45 p.m. – 04.45 p.m.</p>	<p>Humanitarian Assistance – <i>Ms Stephanie Bunker</i> Migration – <i>Ms Anke Strauss</i> Lunch Break Terrorism – <i>Mr Mitchell Hsieh</i> The Future of the United Nations – <i>Mr Peter Jackson</i></p>
<p><i>7 April 2009</i></p> <p>09.30 a.m. – 10.30 a.m. 11.15 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.</p>	<p>Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations – <i>Messrs Philip J. Bené and Lucas W. Swanepoel</i> Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations – <i>Mr Roland Tricot</i></p>
<p><i>8 April 2009</i></p> <p>11.00 a.m. – 12.00 p.m.</p>	<p>Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations – <i>Ms Fleur Davies and Mr Andrew Rose</i></p>

5.1. Briefing on Peacekeeping, Mr Andreas Sugar

The first topic of our Study Tour through the institutions of the *United Nations* (UN) system was the issue of peacekeeping. It was for this reason that Mr Andreas Sugar, Political Affairs Officer in the Africa Division of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, gave us a very interesting presentation on the concept of peacekeeping, its key principles, as well as the history and the main challenges.

He referred to peacekeeping as a tool to help stabilise countries and prevent them from returning to conflict or becoming failed states that might cause severe security problems. The task of implementing peacekeeping missions is assigned to the Blue Helmet forces. With a over 110,000 men and women serving today, UN peacekeeping operations are the largest multi-lateral contributor to post conflict stabilisation in the world, and only the US has more troops deployed abroad. The number of UN peacekeepers increased seven-fold over the last ten years.



Mr Sugar added that peacekeeping can be regarded as a cheap tool, as its expenses only account for 0.5 per cent of the world's military expenditures.

He also stated that peacekeeping operations aim to support fragile governments and institutions and to create buffer-zones in order to separate opposing troops. UN peacekeeping draws its legitimacy through being a representative of almost the

whole world.

In addition, Mr Sugar elaborated on the key principles of peacekeeping. These include impartiality, the consent of the parties, the use of force only for the purpose of self-defence. Mr Sugar added that it is impossible to impose peace and that the main parties will have to be committed to a peace process.

If those basic tenets are present, peacekeeping operations can help a country to 'get back on track'. Also, refugees have the opportunity to return to their homes and children can attend school again.

Another topic of the briefing was the history of peacekeeping. The concept of peacekeeping is not mentioned in the *UN Charter* because it was not foreseen by the Founding Members of the UN.

The first peacekeeping operation was established in 1948 and deals with Israel and its Arab neighbours. In the late 1980's, as a result of the end of the Cold War, there was a move towards a new generation of peacekeeping missions. The superpowers were able to

form a common view and thereby end the deadlock in the Security Council. Instead of conflicts between East and West, new sorts of conflicts arose: for example, civil wars in Africa or in the Balkans, which forced the peacekeeping operations to adapt to this new situation. The operations included police operations, assisting refugees, conducting elections, monitoring human rights and even taking over the government for a period of time, e.g. in East Timor.

But then success turned into failure. As a reaction to the new generation of conflicts, peacekeepers were sent to ongoing conflicts, where there existed no peace to keep. As a result, in Rwanda, Somalia or Bosnia peacekeepers became part of the conflicts or could do little to end them. These perceived failures had a direct impact on the numbers of peacekeeping troops. While in 1994, there were 14 operations with 80,000 troops, there was a dramatic decrease to only 13,000 troops in 1999.

As a reaction to this situation, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan set up a panel that published the *Brahimi Report*, a report, which analysed the lessons learned from the operations of the 1990s and offered a number of recommendations for future peacekeeping. These lessons include the need to have a clear mandate and enough resources to enable adequate implementation. Furthermore, it is essential to be upfront with the Security Council and not simply tell them what it wants to hear but rather what it needs to know. Another lesson learned was the urgency of strengthening the understaffed Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

These lessons were subsequently applied in many post-conflict scenarios such as Sierra-Leone or Timor-Leste. As a consequence, the international community regained confidence in peacekeeping operations and nowadays we see the highest level of engagement in history with a total of around 110,000 troops.

According to Mr Sugar, some obstacles remain in the way of peacekeeping operations being able to meet demand for them. One example is the generation of enough well-trained and –equipped troops: most are provided by developing countries, with few from the West. While the developed countries provide political and financial support to peacekeeping operations, they remain reluctant to send personnel in large numbers. This is a shame, since ‘boots on the ground’ show real commitment. Moreover, the Blue Helmet forces could benefit from the specialised units and advanced technologies of Western states.

In recent years, there has been a tendency to forget the lessons of the 1990s, and peacekeepers have once again been sent into situations where there is little peace to keep, for example in Darfur. There must be a clear differentiation between peacekeeping and peace-enforcement missions.

In conclusion, Mr Sugar noted that UN peacekeeping is a unique tool at the disposal of the international community for doing the work that few states have the capacity or will to do on their own.

Lucas Skupin

5.2. Briefing on Refugees, Mr Gonzalo Vargas Llosa

Forced to flee one's home and leaving everything behind without knowing whether one would ever return is the situation that millions of people around the world are facing today. In 1950, the *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees* (UNHCR) was established as a specialised agency of the General Assembly to address the urgent needs of refugees.

On the first day of our Study Tour, we had the chance to meet with Mr Gonzalo Vargas Llosa, the Senior Policy Advisor to the UNHCR. He informed us about the historical background of the organisation, the major ongoing humanitarian operations and the challenges the organisation is facing today.



Since the *1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, the situation of refugees has dramatically changed. Back then, the number of refugees was 1 million people, mostly Europeans, as a consequence of World War II. Today, the number of people who have been forced to leave their homes has increased to 32 million people, most of them are Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). The mandate of the UNHCR, however, still is primarily concerned with people falling under the definition of refugees set out by the *1951 Convention*: people who feel compelled to leave their homes because of a genuine fear of persecution due to ethnical, political or religious reasons. This definition draws a clear distinction between refugees and economic migrants.

The second category that is covered by the organisation's mandate is stateless persons, a group that is much less known and whose situation is much more complicated than refugees. Stateless persons live without any legal documents and nationality and are thus hardly to be identified, since the host country is often reluctant to release information. While refugees and stateless persons have been part of the UNHCR's official mandate since the beginning of UNHCR operations in 1951, the organisation increasingly deals with IDPs. IDPs are people who had to leave their homes because of the same reasons as refugees, who stay, however, within the country. This phenomenon has become especially relevant due to the changing nature of conflicts since 1990, with internal conflicts becoming the major conflict structure and thus leading to a change in forced displacement.

Within this changing environment of conflicts, the UNHCR is committed to providing legal assistance and individual advice to refugees about states' and refugees' obligations under the 1951 Convention and monitoring state behaviour. As most refugees flee to poor neighbouring countries (most of them in Africa), the work of the UNHCR also includes providing material support and establishing refugee camps to assist the recipient countries in dealing with incoming refugees.

The UNHCR is committed to finding permanent solutions: many refugees enjoy their rights only on paper, however: many are not allowed to work, or even to leave the camp. To address this situation, the UNHCR encourages voluntary return as the most favourable option after war has ended or the 'agent of persecution' is gone. As an alternative, the UNHCR promotes the local integration of refugees in the host countries. This implies changing the status of a refugee to a resident or even a national citizen status. Another alternative constitutes the resettlement of refugees to a developed third country with better economic and security options.

32 millions of people that have fled their homes today – this makes the work of the UNHCR more necessary in even more places than ever before. Mr Vargas Llosa highlighted the devastating situation in Iraq with 2 million IDPs and 2 million refugees that have mostly fled to Syria and Jordan. The initial hope for a possible return in 2003 was quickly disappointed, only the past 6–8 months have shown some improvement in the situation.

Another enduring humanitarian refugee crisis is the situation in Darfur in Sudan, where the continuing conflict has caused 2 million IDPs to leave their homes and 200,000 refugees to flee to Chad, where they also have an impact on the internal conflict there. The logistic challenges of the country and the role of the Sudanese Government make the work of the UNHCR increasingly difficult and challenging: aid workers have to travel in helicopters to get around the country and the Sudanese President recently expelled 13 of the most important international NGOs in retaliation against the warrant of arrest issued by the *International Criminal Court* (ICC) in March this year. Most of the time the UNHCR workers have to negotiate with the Sudanese Government to be able to deliver aid – they also tried to persuade the government to reverse its decision with the help of influential countries such as China – without success, however. A joint UN/Sudanese Government needs assessment showed that there is not enough capacity among the remaining NGOs. As a consequence, it is again the IDPs and refugees in the region who suffer.

A third country Mr Vargas Llosa mentioned is Colombia, a country that has often been overlooked despite an ongoing, low-intensity conflict between the state and leftwing guerrillas. Despite some improvements under the Uribe government, figures estimate that at least 3 million IDPs and 250,000 refugees have fled mostly to Ecuador and Venezuela, with some fleeing to Panama and Costa Rica.

How should the UNHCR protect the space for asylum in the context of a globalised and insecure world? Today, over 200 million people are not living in their own country, but only 1 in 10 falls into the category of a refugee. States receiving (illegal) economic migrants try to increase their border control mechanisms, which also has consequences for

refugees. It is difficult to distinguish refugees from economic migrants and thus special attention is required. After September 11, governments have reacted by ensuring that people threatening their country's security could not enter, with unintended consequences for refugees.

In ensuring refugee and IDP protection in the near future the most important challenge for the UN is, according to Mr Vargas Llosa, to restore the UN's neutrality and its perception as an independent actor. The *Organization's* credibility, currently questioned by some radical groups, is necessary to ensure the safety of UN staff on the ground. The bombings of the Baghdad headquarters in 2003 and the Algiers headquarters in 2007 as well as the kidnapping of a UNHCR worker in Pakistan show how the loss of credibility makes the UNHCR's work on the ground more difficult. Some groups' resentment of the political bodies of the UN, such as the Security Council, has long range consequences for the work of the humanitarian bodies and the security of UN staff on the ground. Only an organisation that is perceived as neutral and independent can successfully protect its personnel and the people it is intended to care for: refugees and IDPs.

Gisela Hirschmann

5.3. Briefing on the Millennium Development Goals, Mr Donald Lee

The briefing on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) was given by Mr Donald Lee, Chief of the Poverty Eradication and Employment Section at the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. It was an interesting moment to present an update on the achievements of the MDGs, as the *G20* meeting had just taken place in April 2009 and Mr Lee let us know that a communiqué had been released amounting to US\$ 1.3 trillion for the financial crisis and US\$ 50 billion for developing countries. However, a few times in his presentation Mr Lee also pointed out that money on its own is not sufficient to address international problems. The MDGs were formed to reach the people all over the world and can be divided into two main pillars: economic development and social development. However, it must be said that those two complement each other and one cannot be achieved without addressing the other.



The MDGs contain seven economic and social indicators and one social and global indicator. According to those, the living standards have improved, i.e. the proportion of the developing world's population living in extreme economic poverty has fallen from 52 per

cent in 1981 to 26 per cent in 2005. Infant mortality rates in low- and middle-income countries have fallen from 87 per 1,000 live births in 1980 to 54 in 2006. There are eight MDGs which address the major development challenges of our time. Each Goal contains specific time-bound Targets which countries have made a commitment to achieve by 2015.

An often asked question is what exactly the UN had been doing before the year 2000 in the field that the MDGs address. Well, it had specified deadlines and then in the year 2000 there was a huge conference in New York where the UN agreed on that the MDGs had to be achieved by 2015. The tool to accomplish these Goals was, on the one hand, to draw the governments' attention on these Goals, but on the other to also apply peer pressure. An example where this tactic has proven to be efficient is in the General Assembly: Countries have to present their progress on the MDGs and it can be very embarrassing for countries to admit that they have not made sufficient progress in the achievement of the MDGs in front of those countries they receive huge amounts of donor money from.

The first Goal is to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, but the actual Target is to halve poverty by 2015. Poverty is a global problem, the measurement of how much the poorest have per day has just been raised from US\$ 1 to US\$ 1.25 by the World Bank.

Mr Lee said, 'Because poor people, in particular the poorest, need to possess the capabilities and assets to capture and exploit opportunities to escape the clutches of poverty. The poorest need to be empowered, and empowerment means increasing the capacity of individuals and groups to make choices and to transform those choices into actions and outcomes.' Goal 1 addresses poverty and hunger. The problem the UN often faces is where to target its efforts, which country does need what kind of help? East Asia has achieved a tremendous reduction of poverty, especially in China. On the other hand, India and Africa remain very poor. In South Asia and Africa (many so-called least developed countries) there are still the most people living in poverty.

The second Goal is to achieve universal primary education, with the Target to ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.

The third Goal is to promote gender equality and empower women; the Target is to eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015. One indicator is the number of schools for children; however, children are often the only capital to improve the standard of living of their parents, a major problem is child exploitation, especially as girls often have to take care of their siblings. Girls should however not stay at home. There needs to be an equal chance for girls to achieve their full potential. In this context, Mr Lee called upon men to do more in the household, as the world is changing.

The fourth Goal is to reduce child mortality. As health is endangered, the Target is to reduce the under-five mortality rate by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015.

Goal 5 is to improve maternal health with the first Target being to reduce the maternal mortality ratio by three quarters and the second to achieve universal access to reproductive health. Birth control is of course one of the controversial issues where there were

many disparities. Yet, the UN does not have a religious point of view in this matter, but is rather apprehensive with the rate of reproduction under the aspect of empowerment of women.

Goal 6 is to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. Target 1 is to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS; Target 2 is to achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS and Target 3 to reverse the emergence of malaria and other major diseases. Mr Lee stressed that HIV is hardest to deal with but that malaria is actually easy to handle, e.g. through the use of mosquito nets, which nonetheless have to be provided. The HIV/AIDS pandemic decimates the family structure, parents die and there are many orphans, raised by grandparents, which often leads to child poverty, a destroyed community and leads to child labour.

The seventh Goal is to ensure environmental sustainability, Target 1 is to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources and Target 2 is to reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss, Target 3 is to halve, by 2015, the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation and Target 4 is to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020. This Goal has its roots in the 1992 Rio conference where the UN first looked at the effects of climate change. However, this Goal goes beyond climate change, it encompasses renewable resources but also ways of production and consumption especially in developing countries. Such causal connections as the effects of deforestation which lead to desertification which is encroaching more and more to the cities have to be controlled and further examined. Otherwise farmers have to grow crops in the dust.

Goals 1 to 7 reflect objectives that need to be accomplished in close co-operation with governments; Goal 8 on the other hand is related to the action we can take as a group.

Goal 8 deals with the international and regional level, formulates partnerships and not only between donor and recipient countries but beyond that. Each country has a responsibility. It is of the utmost importance to assist other countries, but governments need to abstain from corruption and especially developing countries must have the opportunity to participate in global trade in a fair manner. As Mr Lee stated: *'In this world, governments cannot isolate themselves from the world [...] Size does not matter, rather the willingness to dialogue'*. Goal 8 is formulating the need for a creation of a global partnership for development. Target 1 addresses the special needs of least developed countries, land-locked developing countries and small island developing states, Target 2 calls to develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system; Target 3 deals comprehensively with developing countries' debt; Target 4 addresses co-operation with pharmaceutical companies and Target 5 attends the co-operation with the private sector, calls the private sector to make available benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications. The most recent data on the actual progress towards achieving the MDGs shows that many countries – especially the poorest countries in Africa – are unlikely to meet many of the Targets. In fact, in some countries the social and economic indicators are worsening. The achievement of these Goals will require concerted and integrated action at all levels – the national, regional and interna-

tional. Such action must be built on the recognition that people matter and that they must be given the rights and means to actively participate in determining their social and economic development.

'Goal setting is better than not having a goal.'

Suleika Suntken

5.4. Briefing on Peacebuilding, Mr Matti Lehtonen

Mr Lehtonen was the last speaker on the first day of our Study Tour and his topic was anticipated by many of us, especially because it was so topical. Mr Lehtonen gave us a briefing on the work of the *Peacebuilding Commission* (PBC) before going on to discuss the *Peacebuilding Support Office*, where he works. The *Peacebuilding Commission*, an intergovernmental advisory body in the *United Nations* (UN) system, supports countries that have suffered from conflict and assists them in building and/or rebuilding structures that will nurture sustainable peace. Its main aim is to bring together all relevant actors in the field (combining security and development aspects) and thereby optimise peacebuilding efforts. Moreover, since adequate funding is the key to successful peacebuilding, one of the *Commission's* tasks is to marshal resources. Additionally, there is a voluntary *Peacebuilding Fund*, where donors may contribute additional resources that can be made available quickly when necessary.



As Mr Lehtonen told us, the UN's new peacebuilding architecture was established after the World Summit in 2005 and it has sought to find innovative and more efficient ways to support the successful rebuilding of peaceful societal structures. The PBC and the *Peacebuilding Support Office* is only about to gain more experience by dealing with the current cases of Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau and the Central African Republic. Yet despite

the challenges and difficulties of the task, Mr Lehtonen told us that he considers his work rather innovative.

The Commission was established by both Security Council (Resolution S/RES/1645 (2005)) and General Assembly resolutions and consists of 31 Members. Seven of them come from the Security Council, including its Permanent Members. The General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council are each allowed to elect another seven Members. Five more Members come from the biggest financial contributors to the UN budget so that they know where their contributions are being spent. The last five Members are

sent by the biggest contributors to the UN Blue Helmets so that they have a say when it comes to where to send their forces. By splitting up the *Commission's* Members into representatives from different countries and different backgrounds, the UN pays tribute to its many diverse Member States and their aims.

Mr Lehtonen briefly outlined the structure of the UN peacebuilding architecture. The first pillar is the *Peacebuilding Commission* itself. The second pillar consists of the *Peacebuilding Fund*, which was established to raise additional funds for Peacebuilding with an initial funding target of US\$ 250 million. At present, more than 45 donors have contributed over US\$ 300 million to the fund in order to assist countries in their efforts to recover from conflict and create peaceful structures. The *Fund* can provide catalytic assistance at a time when other funding mechanisms may not be available for pressing peacebuilding needs.

The last pillar is the *Peacebuilding Support Office*, where Mr Lehtonen himself is dedicated to improving the strategic frameworks of today's peacebuilding. This of course includes analyzing the lessons learned in the UN system and wider as well as country-specific data and developing peacebuilding strategies that address the particular needs in each unique situation. Mr Lehtonen often mentioned the projects in Sierra Leone and the Central African Republic where he has been personally involved in work related to peacebuilding strategies adopted by the PBC. He has been working in this field for the last year and likes to remember the words of Kofi Annan during the opening session of the PBC in 2006: *'The Commission represents a symbol of both hope and perseverance: hope for the many millions of people throughout the world who are striving to keep their societies on the fragile road to peace; and perseverance, because you have overcome considerable difficulties to get this new and vital endeavour up and running.'* (UN Press Release PBC/1 of 23 June 2006)

At the end, Mr Lehtonen was happy to answer all our questions and we were very grateful for the interesting insight he was willing to give us in the course of our UN Study Tour as well as for the vivid discussion.

Franziska Weil

5.5. Briefing on the International Atomic Energy Agency, Ms Tracy C. Brown

The first briefing on our second day was on the work of the *International Atomic Energy Agency* (IAEA) by Ms Tracy C. Brown, Public Information Officer in the *Agency's* Liaison Office in New York.

The Liaison Office's work can be considered twofold: on the one hand, it has a political focus, on the other hand, the other important task is public information. Regarding the former, the IAEA's office addresses the topics discussed at the *Agency's* headquarters in Vienna, such as nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation, the civil use of nuclear energy, or technical co-operation in the nuclear field, to the *United Nations* family and other international organisations. It also reports back to Vienna on developments concerning matters that are within its mandate. Ms Brown also stated that the New York Office explains the work of the IAEA to the public, as she did to us.

She then outlined the crucial points for the creation and evolution of the IAEA. After the horrific experience of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, various proposals were discussed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons technology while promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This led to the creation of the *Agency* in 1957 as an autonomous organisation with the purpose of promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy while helping to prevent its military uses. However, it co-operates closely with the *United Nations*, e.g. it reports annually to the General Assembly and, in case of non-compliance with international law amounting to a threat to international peace and security, to the Security Council.



Ms Brown went on explaining the organisational structure of the IAEA. Once a year, the General Conference meets in Vienna. It consists of all 146 Member States to decide on the *Agency's* budget and programme, as well as other topics raised by the Board of Governors, the Director-General or Member States.

Furthermore, the 35-Member Board of Governors meets five times per year to decide on major policy issues, especially the approval of nuclear safeguards agreements with Member States. It also appoints the Director-General with the approval of the General Conference. The current Director General of the IAEA is Mohammed ElBaradei, but a new Director General is to be elected in early July and Ms Brown pointed out that right now, the question of whom that will be is a hot issue within the *Agency*.

Ms Brown then explained that the IAEA rests on three pillars: firstly, its technical co-operation programme; secondly, nuclear safety and security; and thirdly, the verification system.

Ms Brown then explained that the IAEA rests on three pillars: firstly, its technical co-operation programme; secondly, nuclear safety and security; and thirdly, the verification system.

Regarding the first pillar, the *Agency* tries to guarantee all Member States access to the benefits of peaceful nuclear technologies. In this spirit, it assists its Members, especially developing countries, in accordance with their national priorities and necessities. As Ms Brown noted, civil nuclear technology applications range from nuclear power production to much less known applications as the treatment of diseases, the sterilisation of mosquitoes by nuclear treatment, the improvement of food crops by nuclear technologies or the application of nuclear technologies for the production of pesticides.

With regard to the second pillar, nuclear safety and security, Ms Brown highlighted the international community's determination to leave nuclear safety as a national responsibility. Therefore, the IAEA can only assist in security and safety matters if invited to do so by Member States. The *Agency* does, however, promote the highest standards and the accession to international conventions regarding nuclear safety. As an example, Ms

Brown mentioned the IAEA's establishment of international information standards each Member State has to follow in case of nuclear accidents. Several conventions on nuclear safety have lead to peer pressure on those Member States, who do not comply with international standards. The *Agency's* ultimate aim regarding nuclear safety and security is the protection of people and environment from exposure to radiation. Ms Brown also said that there was a comprehensive review on efforts to prevent nuclear terrorism since September 11.

Concerning the verification pillar, she told us that the Member States of the IAEA have created a framework of international conventions between the *Agency* and the respective Member States, the so-called safeguard agreements, which enable the IAEA to monitor and verify that the Member States' use of nuclear technology has only peaceful intentions. According to Ms Brown, the *Non-Proliferation Treaty* (NPT) has created a dichotomy of nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states. It imposes on the latter to declare their nuclear facilities and material. Under its third pillar, the IAEA verifies through on-site inspections, information in the media, on the internet or provided by intelligence reports, including satellite imagery. After gathering the information, the *Agency* compiles confidential reports that are considered by the Board of Governors. In case of non-compliance, the report may be passed on to the Security Council that can then take the appropriate measures to bring the country back on track.

Following the discovery of illegal nuclear weapon programmes by Iraq and North Korea, a new standard of nuclear verification has been elaborated, the *Additional Protocol* to the safeguards agreements. Ms Brown highlighted the importance of its universal ratification, as it gives the IAEA more rights for nuclear verification. She then noted that nuclear verification is far from perfect, as the IAEA does not have the powers to impose inspections on any State, a right that only the Security Council under Chapter VII has. Nevertheless, she told the group that the safeguards system is 'the best we have' and provides the measures for assurance and confidence-building between Member States, thereby enhancing international security.

Ms Brown then turned to the case of Iran. She mentioned that Iran's right to acquire peaceful nuclear technology is unquestioned, but that it is not unconditional. Iran's failure to disclose its nuclear programme to the IAEA as stipulated in the NPT, undermined the confidence in the peaceful nature of the programme. Until now, the *Agency* was not able to draw final conclusions on the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities. Despite various activities by the IAEA, e.g. confidence-building measures, and diverse Security Council resolutions, Iran was not willing to co-operate. Ms Brown also referred to the difficult position of Iran, which is not only surrounded by nuclear states as India, Pakistan, Israel and US troops in Afghanistan, Turkey and Iraq. Furthermore Iran's uranium enrichment programme is not illegal per se as long as it is restricted to civil purposes. To understand Iran's motives, one has to keep in mind all these complex factors. Asked if a security guarantee for Iran given by the United States would change Iran's pursuit to nuclear weapons, Ms Brown was not very optimistic. Until now, she said, there have not been acceptable offers for Iran and even the stance of the new US Government would not change it. Ultimately, a complete renunciation of nuclear weapons by all states is the only real possibility to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, she

said. As long as there are 'haves' and 'have-nots' in terms of nuclear weapons, the possibilities to prevent their spread are not very promising.

With regard to the future of nuclear disarmament, Ms Brown appeared hopeful: she said that new pronouncements by the leaders of the US and the United Kingdom were quite promising. Nevertheless, she pointed out that promising words have to be followed by actions. Asked if the *Agency* had any measures to enforce nuclear disarmament, she made clear that there are no such possibilities and that it is completely up to the willingness of the nuclear weapon states to take steps in this direction.

Concerning proposals to make a withdrawal from the NPT harder to prevent cases like North Korea, Ms Brown was not very optimistic. However, there are indeed some good proposals to strengthen the NPT at its Review Conference in 2010.

Concluding the briefing, Ms Brown offered her help concerning internship opportunities in the IAEA, as the *Agency* would always need young and talented people to pursue its goals.

Florian Lewerenz and Philipp Jornitz

5.6. Briefing on the United Nations Development Fund for Women, Mr Antonie de Jong and Ms Hazel Gooding

On 3 April 2009, students from the *Freie Universität* Delegation were fortunate enough to spend an hour with Mr Antonie de Jong and Ms Hazel Gooding from the Outreach and Business Development Team of *United Nations Development Fund for Women* (UNIFEM). UNIFEM is the women's fund at the *United Nations* providing financial and technical assistance to programmes and strategies, to promote women's empowerment and gender equality. Areas of focus include fostering women's economic rights and their security as well as assisting in securing gender equality in democratic governance in times of peace and of war.



Mr de Jong began by describing his personal background home in the Netherlands and how this led eventually to his career within the *United Nations* system. He then moved on to summarising the history of UNIFEM, which owes its existence to the women's movement that preceded it. Mr de Jong made reference to the initial temporary nature of the Fund, (initially set up for the duration of the United Nations Decade for Women, 1975–85). The budget grew from US\$ 15 million in the Nineties to US\$ 100 million in 2007 and US\$ 200 million in 2008.

The mandate of UNIFEM is, according to Mr de Jong, twofold: firstly, to work with Member States to promote women's employment and gender equality in general and; secondly, to work with other UN agencies to implement gender mainstreaming. This mandate is fulfilled through various tasks, one of the most significant being that of ending violence against women; secondly, UNIFEM works on reducing women's poverty and exclusion (and ending the pay disparity between genders). In addition, UNIFEM works to promote gender-responsive budgeting. Mr de Jong offered a concrete example at this juncture: as an attempt to jumpstart the US economy, President Obama had recently mentioned the use of infrastructure as a vehicle for this. As improvements to infrastructure will require construction workers (most of whom are men) gender-responsive budgeting offers the platform to redress the imbalance through the introduction of new policies and/or policy amendments. A further task of UNIFEM is in relation to the 'feminisation of HIV/AIDS'. Young women are 1.6 times more likely to be living with HIV than young men. Young women make up over 60 per cent of 15–24-year-olds living with HIV and therefore, the gender dynamic should not be ignored: married women are also a 'high-risk' group. Furthermore, UNIFEM seeks to advance the political participation of women – Mr de Jong noted that only about 18 per cent of parliamentarians worldwide are women.

By way of example of the kind of work that UNIFEM is involved in, Mr de Jong spoke about the UN's 'Say NO to Violence' campaign, and actress' Nicole Kidman's work as UNIFEM's goodwill ambassador. Fundraising and awareness-raising are the aims of the campaign, particularly as this year plays hosts to several important anniversaries such as the 30th anniversary of the *Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women* (CEDAW), and the 10th anniversary of Security Council Resolution S/RES/1325 (2000) on Women and Peace and Security coming up next year.

At this point, Ms Gooding spoke to the work of UNIFEM with the donor countries. She noted that UNIFEM is a small organisation in relation to other UN Funds and Programmes, however, UNIFEM works towards improving the lives of women and girls in more than 100 countries around the world in partnership with various stakeholders including donor governments. As the FU Delegation of 2009 represented Australia, Ms Gooding also mentioned UNIFEM's close partnership with the government of Australia, particularly in dealing with the issue of violence against women, which is a challenge in various Pacific Island countries. The *UN Trust Fund* (managed by UNIFEM) was noted here as having a key role to play in terms of financing innovative and catalytic interventions.

After giving us a quick round-up of women's rights and where they were first realised in various parts of the world (e.g. New Zealand was the first country to afford women the right to vote) as well as commenting on the most progressive countries, one of which was Austria, Ms Gooding moved on to discuss gender mainstreaming, which is a big issue in gender politics. Mr de Jong and Ms Gooding then opened up the floor to questions – an opportunity fully taken advantage of by the FU Delegation.

In response to the question regarding how UNIFEM works in individual countries – i.e. whether by invitation or otherwise – the importance of negotiation was highlighted. In the Gulf States, UNIFEM has not had such a great presence but negotiation is slowly

changing this, in addition to various local projects which demonstrate what success may be ahead. Similarly, the reception of UNIFEM's programmes in various countries depends on the cultural sensitivities at play. One student noted that, in some countries, women themselves often expressed no dissatisfaction with the kind of discrimination UNIFEM seeks to prevent. In this regard, the Millennium Development Goals – more specifically, education for all – were mentioned.

One student asked about the sensitive issue of female genital mutilation and whether this was part of UNIFEM's remit, to which the answer was given that UNIFEM works in collaboration with various stakeholders including other UN agencies that, for instance, focus on this particular issue (such as the UN Population Fund).

Next, the discussion moved to trade and to the effect the global economic crisis may have specifically on women. For example, there has been a significant migration of Asian-Pacific women to the Gulf States – there is a danger that women might be sent back to their countries of origin due to the current economic crisis. The issue of 'brain drain' out of many developing countries was also discussed.

One example of co-operation could be seen with female entrepreneurs in local communities, whether refugee or otherwise. It was noted that – although often illiterate – they are resourceful and capable of independently running their own businesses. In general, UNIFEM works on a wide variety of topics, some of which may indeed thematically overlap with other agencies' work and which therefore requires close inter-agency collaboration not only in terms of efficiency but ultimately to achieve maximum impact on the ground. In working towards securing gender justice in peacebuilding, for example, changes may be necessary in the area of land law and in the legal system in general to foster equity and equality, for the benefit of all.

Nicola Shiels

5.7. Briefing on the Responsibility to Protect, Ms Rafaela Fernandes

On Friday, 3 April 2009, we had the pleasure to be briefed on the topic of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) by Ms Rafaela Fernandes who works at the *United Nations* (UN) Secretariat.

Ms Fernandes began by saying that the concept of the Responsibility to Protect has its origin in the concept of Human Security, which is a holistic approach that places the individual at the centre instead of the state. Some say that the Responsibility to Protect is a cousin to the concept of humanitarian intervention. Humanitarian Intervention involves a usually military intervention of one state into another one for the purpose of forcing the latter state to stop committing gross violations of human rights, e.g. regarding minority groups. This concept was used to prevent or at least mitigate genocide and other human rights violations, but this it has been widely criticised. Legal scholars and many politicians argue that this principle is open for abuse for instance in circumstances when stronger states want to intervene in smaller states under the pretence of human rights protection.



Ms Fernandes went on to say that the Responsibility to Protect rests on three pillars: firstly, the responsibility of each Member State to protect its citizens; secondly, the responsibility of the international community to assist countries in discharging their duties; and thirdly, the timely and decisive response by the international community, if a state does not fulfil its duty.

Concerning the first pillar, she stated that sovereignty was not

only a privilege, but it also entails a certain number of obligations. The second pillar can be considered as the first pillar's corollary: it places an obligation to help a state on the other countries. She emphasised that most states are not unwilling to protect their citizens but are unable to do so.

Underlining the importance of sovereignty, the concept of the Responsibility to Protect is limited to four types of crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing. It is not meant to be applied in case of a natural disaster.

Ms Fernandes pointed at the 2005 *World Summit Outcome* (A/RES/60/1) that defines the Responsibility to Protect in its paragraphs 138 and 139. She noted that it was the best possible outcome given certain divisions among Member States on the question.

The divisions concerned mostly the third pillar, the timely and decisive action. Paragraph 139 provides that it is up to the Security Council to decide on each case, thus ruling out any unilateral action and providing for several caveats. The case-by-case basis will lead to a discussion every time a situation is submitted to the Security Council. The decision will need consensus and support by the Members of the Council.

According to Ms Fernandes, instead of focussing on the military aspect, the discussions should rather concentrate on the preventive and co-operation aspects, the concept of the Responsibility to Protect encompasses. However, whenever discussions are led on the concept, many other topics are woven into it, such as the topic of Security Council reform or development assistance, which sours the debate.

Yet, Ms Fernandes views the main problem the *United Nations* are facing today in the operationalisation of the Responsibility to Protect, translating it from theory into practice, so that it can help people around the world.

It was a very interesting briefing on one of the most intriguing debates in international foreign policy and law and we are very thankful to Ms Fernandes for being open to all kinds of questions and thereby given us a lot of insight on how the UN functions.

Christoph Berkemeier

5.8. Briefing on Humanitarian Assistance, Ms Stephanie Bunker

Ms Stephanie Bunker, a very energetic and passionate woman, is spokesperson of the *United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs* (OCHA) in New York. Briefing us on humanitarian assistance, she started with an introductory overview summarising mainly when and where aid is provided as well as how it is funded and which basic principles humanitarian aid should ideally follow.



Humanitarian assistance is provided in complex emergencies or natural disasters. A complex emergency is for example a situation in which the situation cannot be dealt with by any one responder, including the state. This happens mostly in cases of conflict, often marked by human rights violations, sometimes accompanied by the absence of a recognised government in charge and/or functioning banks or infra-

structure. Natural disasters include floods, earthquakes, windstorms (hurricanes, cyclones, etc.), volcanic eruptions and tsunamis, as well as droughts or even (potentially) epidemics. These may also occur within complex emergencies. Countries that require humanitarian assistance are, for example, Sudan, Afghanistan and Somalia, while Asia is the continent most frequently hit by natural disasters. Africa experiences both natural disasters and conflicts. A country affected by a complex emergency or a disaster needs to agree to accept humanitarian assistance before UN staff is allowed to provide it.

Humanitarian assistance operates according to three main principles. It should be impartial, independent and neutral. Impartiality means that provision of humanitarian assistance must not be based on nationality, race, religion, or political point of view. It must be based on need alone. Independence means that humanitarian agencies must formulate and implement their own policies independently of government policies or actions. Neutrality usually refers to the provision of humanitarian aid in an impartial and independent manner, based on need alone, avoidance of taking sides and providing aid without strings or conditions attached to it. But Ms Bunker admitted that this is a sensitive subject since most of the aid is provided by donor countries, which can of course choose freely which countries they want to support. This decision cannot be guaranteed to be free from any political interests or the intention to exert some kind of influence. But there are also cases where countries give unearmarked money to the UN, thereby assigning the power about the distribution on projects or countries to the UN.

This brings us to the next topic: money. There is a *Central Emergency Response Fund*, which is rather small, with a maximum total of US\$ 500 million per year. This money is completely 'unearmarked'. About two thirds of the money is reserved for sudden onset

emergencies and one third is given to support underfunded emergency situations. An obvious advantage of this money is that it can be provided really fast and that it is unconditional (however about US\$ 50 million are provided in loans). Generally, apart from the *Central Emergency Response Fund*, the UN estimates an amount they expect to be necessary for the upcoming year. At the end of 2008 they determined that US\$ 7.7 billion for known extant humanitarian aid purposes, which was the biggest amount ever requested. But meanwhile due to unexpected events the appeal grew to US\$ 8.5 billion. By the time of our briefing less than one-third of the money had been given to the UN and on average only about two thirds of the money appealed will get in by the end of the year.

Preceding with the question how to deal with governments misusing money from humanitarian aid, Ms Bunker explained that the aid does normally not go to governments but to the UN and to NGOs, who are very important and irreplaceable in humanitarian work. But still sometimes money or aid can get stolen or misused. In some cases, aid agencies may decide not to send aid to areas where it has been misappropriated to exert some pressure on those groups. Another question was what kind of aid is provided. As already mentioned, part of the aid to people in need may be in the form of money, but often it is services or commodities that are provided. Especially in cases where domestic markets do not function or lack materials, real assets like food, water, clothes and blankets are very important. Additionally the humanitarian assistance can include medical care or vehicles (like ambulances). But the big advantage of cash compared to real assets is that it does not need so much space, which keeps transportation and logistic costs low. Additionally the domestic economies are strengthened if products are bought within the country.

Another problematic situation sometimes arises if the countries in emergency do not want to permit humanitarian aid to enter their territory. Since, as already mentioned, the country has to allow the UN to get in and help, humanitarian assistance actually depending on this admission. Then, sometimes closed-door negotiations need to take place. Some countries are concerned about their national image when asking for aid, yet sometimes they are willing to accept aid – without asking for it.

Getting out of involvement in a country is also an interesting topic. In case of disasters the government and the UN discuss phasing out humanitarian aid and moving toward aid directed at rehabilitation, recovery and development. Normally there is a process of transition in which humanitarian aid vanishes step by step and UN programmes dealing with building up the country like development aid advance over time.

Ms Bunker's presentation was very informative and exciting, granting a very good look behind the scenes.

Anne Zimmer

5.9. Briefing on Migration, Ms Anke Strauss

Our briefing on Migration was held by Ms Anke Strauss, who is Liaison Officer of the *International Organization for Migration (IOM)* to the *United Nations*. The briefing gave us a basic introduction to the work of the IOM. In addition to that, Ms Strauss focused on

the impact of the global economic crisis on migration and of the situation of Australia. As an intergovernmental organisation, the IOM is not a Member of the UN but holds Observer status at the General Assembly.

Ms Strauss stated that the IOM is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits migrants and society. The *Organization* has offices in over 100 different countries whose work focuses on migration management, advancing the understanding of migration issues, encouraging social and economic development through migration and furthering the human dignity and well-being of migrants.

Ms Strauss gave us an overview on the global situation that migrants and countries are facing. During the past years, the number of migrants has been constantly increasing. Some reasons for this development are labour migration and the problems caused by climate change. Today there are over 192 million migrants around the globe. The largest number of migrants is leaving their homes in developing countries in order to have a better perspective in the developed world. The problems are not only faced by the big migration countries, like the United States, but also in the developing countries that together with workforce loose one of their greatest powers. Another big group the IOM deals with a great number of political migrants that leave their home due to discrimination or war. This kind of migration mostly affects the receiving countries that are mostly developing neighbouring countries.

The IOM also takes part in intergovernmental negotiations on climate change-induced migration, where particularly small islands have started being affected by global warming and the rising sea level. For example the pacific island of Tonga tries to reach an agreement with the government of New Zealand to move its entire population to its neighbour.

Another big issue the IOM deals with is the rising problem of illegal migration. For example, some 12 million people are living and working illegally in the United States alone. The human trafficking issue has been addressed by the IOM with many different programmes. In the countries of origin, development programmes, in co-operation with different international actors are trying to eliminate the root cause for trafficking. Furthermore education programs in those countries try to provide better chances for children and information campaigns alert to the risk of human trafficking.

The most recent problem the IOM sees coming up is the migration that results from the global economic crisis. Since this is still a very new phenomena there is no well-



grounded statistics available. But anecdotal evidence shows large numbers of job-losing migrants in Middle East. For example in Qatar where about 80 per cent of the population are migrants, we see an increasing number of migrants that lost their job.

This of course affects countries like the Philippines, Bangladesh or any Latin-American country that are depending on large amounts of remittances sent to families by migrants that are working abroad. The problems that this causes for the families back home are obvious. But also the returning migrants have difficulties of reintegrating the society.

Information regarding Australia, traditionally an immigration country, was mainly concerning its immigration policies. Australia has been criticised by many different international human rights organisations for its detention centres. But without an efficient alternative for both migrants and the government, the detention centres seem the only option than leaving them on the boat just off the shore.

Dominik Köhler

5.10 Briefing on Terrorism, Mr Mitchell Hsieh

Our briefing on terrorism was held by Mr Mitchell Hsieh who works as a Public Information Officer at the *United Nations* Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) whose main task is to support the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC). The CTC was established by Security Council Resolution S/RES/1373 (2001), in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. The CTED monitors the implementation of this resolution. This is achieved mostly through reports by Member States, but also through publicly available information provided by the internet or the press, or country visits.

However, terrorism has already been a topic within the UN since the 1960s. International conventions cover a variety of topics dealing with terrorist actions, such as hijacking. In the past years, the General Assembly has been trying to fill the legal gap between these conventions by creating a comprehensive convention on terrorism on the basis of an internationally accepted definition of terrorism. Unfortunately, this remains a difficult attempt due



to the number and cultural variety of the UN Member States. Nevertheless, operating under the *UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy* remains the key for successful counter-terrorism operations, especially since the preparations for terrorist attacks mostly take

place in another than the target country, and as in the case of September 11, may involve a variety of countries.

To create an effective counter-terrorism network, the technical and operational needs of all Member States must be identified by the CTC. This can only be reached by regular country visits and meetings with officials. Not only needs but also existing expertise must be gathered to serve as best practice for other states. Therefore, a taskforce of 24 UN agencies is assisting states with their national plans. Currently, it is still too early to see how effective the taskforce will be, especially since one of its main tasks remains the acquisition of donors. Moreover, more expertise is needed; hence the Secretary-General has already devoted more effort to this topic in the formation of a small unit to deal with requests from Member States.

All the information the CTC collects is published in the *Global Implementation Survey* which serves as a basis for recommendations on the improvement of the countries' anti-terrorism provisions but also for discussions within the Security Council. In general, the following questions have to be kept in mind when the information is collected: Has the country signed and ratified any anti-terrorism convention or is preparing to do so? How strong is the country's financial sector in dealing with suspicious or illegal transactions? How far developed is the apparatus for airport security and customs? Questions regarding human rights versus counter-terrorism measures are also important for States to consider, and a good balance between human rights and counter-terrorism measures must be kept at all times.

Another question concerned the issue of monitoring terrorist activities in the absence of an internationally accepted definition of terrorism. Mr Hsieh told us, that there are nevertheless the 16 conventions on terrorism which have been signed and ratified by most Member States. This legal framework serves as a basis to determine violent acts as being terrorist or not. Moreover, there is an operative definition of terrorism, which declares inter alia that all criminal activity that is proceeded to compel governments towards certain actions or to refrain from actions, is considered an act of terrorism. However, most terrorist acts are performed by non-state actors or rebel groups. This is a problem that must be further addressed and the efforts on finding an international definition on terrorism need to be continued.

Finally, we would like to thank Mr Hsieh for this very interesting and informative briefing.

Kristina Werner

5.11. Briefing on the Future of the United Nations, Mr Peter Jackson

On the 3rd day of our UN study tour we were briefed by Mr Peter Jackson, Chief Editor of the UN Yearbook. Mr Jackson's bright and open-minded way of briefing us, was a really great conclusion to our extraordinarily enriching UN Study Tour.

Since our faculty advisers offered Mr Jackson to choose the topic freely, he talked about the UN system and made us see the *Organization* from a different, more critical, point of view hinting at some actual problems the UN suffers from.



The first topic he addressed was the critique the UN often faces during times of conflict: its value and validity in these situations are put into question, complaining about the fact that the UN's agenda seemingly did not change during the last decades. But topics which repeatedly are on the agenda, such as the fight against poverty, were important topics and still remain issues of actual importance.

Moreover, crucial changes have been made. For example, in the early days of the UN, only a few African countries such as Ethiopia, South Africa or Egypt were Member of the UN. Today, every African country is a UN Member, which is quite important since conflicts in Africa as well as the general situation of African countries regarding issues like health, education or poverty are often key targets of the UN agenda. Thus, the presence of many

African countries guarantees a more effective co-operation between Africa and the UN due to joint agreement on the *UN Charter* and regular meetings to talk and negotiate.

Another example of a long debated topic which has been the cause for major critique of the UN work, Mr Jackson mentioned, was the question of development assistance and why there has not been too much progress in eradicating poverty so far. An example of this, he said, was that the first four UN decades were called the 'Development Decades', while the 5th decade was called the 'Millennium Development Goals', which did not really change too much of the content of the debate but merely modified its title.

Moreover, the issue of donor fatigue is also a much discussed UN related topic since many organisations are asking for money to provide aid in inter alia developing countries. But as money is getting scarce and people are wondering about the efficiency of long term initiatives, such as in many African countries, donations have severely decreased.

During his briefing, Mr Jackson also hinted at the ongoing discussions about the reform of the Security Council. An argument for a reform is that for instance Japan as the second biggest financial contributor should have a permanent seat in the Security Council to have a bigger say in UN policy. But the consequence of such a reform that would be beneficial to Japan might be 'vetoed' by other Members. Those veto rights used, are

often to the detriment of future-oriented and effective changes, thus making UN reform very hard to accomplish since they require a large consensus.

Mr Jackson then made a very alarming point: the problem that recently there is the scary development of more and more UN staff being the target of violent attacks. It therefore seems as if the UN is currently not offered the appropriate respect and thus their staff lack protection in the field.

Related to such attacks is the fact that so much attention was drawn on Darfur that people stopped looking at the deteriorating situation in Somalia.

As a response to those developments, Mr Jackson mentioned the concerns of former Secretary-General Kofi Annan about the effectiveness of long-term mandates. Annan therefore proposed a mechanism to profoundly test each UN initiative after five years on its necessity by analyzing its results, how realistic it is and how it contributed to achieve the objectives pursued. The consequence of negative results would then bring about the closure of the initiative.

Furthermore, the *Oil-For-Food programme* partly degraded the UN image, since UN staff members were said to be corrupt. But that opinion does not consider the fact that only very few personnel was involved in the affair and therefore the general suspicion of UN staff being corrupt was unjustified.

All the aspects mentioned make it necessary to reflect the work of the UN, its legitimacy and effectiveness.

But again and again there are examples which show that the UN is a unique and indispensable tool to restore peace and assure security.

Mr Jackson then gave the example of Charles Taylor, former President of Liberia and responsible for crimes against humanity, who was served with an arrest warrant by the *Special Court for Sierra Leone* and taken into custody by UN Peacekeepers and flown to the detention facilities in Sierra Leone, which symbolised that the UN is actually on the premises when the chips are down.

Mr Jackson also used a comparison to underline the importance of the UN: in his view the UN oftentimes serves in a similar function as firemen do. In times, when there is no fire, the workers only cost money and you are wondering why you even spend it on them, for just being there.

But whenever there is an emergency situation, they are right there and you are happy to have them. This is the same with the UN in a way – it costs money, but the UN is still the only option to solving international problems in an enduring way. The UN is charged with a number of decisive tasks, such as to rescue failing states, assisting States in times of conflict or finding solutions to climate change-related problems. Moreover, it develops and puts forward important ideas and gets countries together to talk to each other.

After the briefing we had the opportunity to ask Mr Jackson questions.

One of the questions raised was whether there are feasible alternatives to the UN.

Mr Jackson answered that there were everyday situations, which show the need to have the UN. It is easy to criticise but hard to find better approaches. The UN, due to the expertise it gained in conflict situations, remains indispensable.

For instance, the US invasion in Iraq in 2003 that was meant to free the Iraqis by bringing democracy to them in only a couple of months, proved to be more difficult than anticipated. The UN experience in such situations should have been sought as the *Organization* has had to handle similar situations and use its patience to work over a period of years to gradually establish long-lasting peace and security.

Mr Jackson concluded his informative and inspiring briefing by saying that the UN remains the only option we have. It is the only organisation which brings together 192 Member States and encourages regular meetings and dialogues among the Members, thus encouraging the opportunity to enhance mutual respect and co-operation.

Christina Tahamtan

5.12 Visit to the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations, Father Philip J. Bené and Mr Lucas W. Swanepoel

On 7 March 2009, we paid a visit to the *Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations* (UN). There, Mr Lucas W. Swanepoel and Father Philip J. Bené kindly elaborated on the Mission's work as well as its history; finally they answered a lot of our questions.

Mr Swanepoel began by pointing out that the Holy See is different from the Vatican. With the conclusion of the *Lateran Treaty* in 1929, the State of the Vatican City was created as an independent state within Rome. Ever since, the Pope exercises the sovereignty over this territory. Independently of the Vatican, the Holy See speaks for the whole *Catholic Church* on behalf of justice and to give a 'voice to the voiceless'. It has relations with over 170 countries.

There are some areas in the world where only the *Church* and the UN have the ability to work (e.g. Sudan, Haiti). The *Catholic Church* – through various organisations such as, e.g. *Caritas Internationalis*– is a major partner of the *World Food Programme* and plays a huge part in the distribution of food. The *Church* is also able to work in areas where the *United Nations* does not have a mandate.



After this interesting introduction, our Delegation used the opportunity to ask quite a few questions. The first question related to the way in which the Holy See reacts towards the criticism that the pope does not represent the developing countries. Mr Swanepoel and Father Bené described this criticism as based on misunderstandings. They stated that the Holy See does not close embassies in developing countries, even in the midst of conflict, and that the *Church* also has a strong development focus and plays a leading role when it comes to the promotion of debt relief.



Concerning how the Holy See deals with issues that do not affect Catholic people, e.g. Muslim countries, Mr Swanepoel said that religious dialogue is very important. He mentioned that recently the first meeting in history between Muslim and Catholic scholars has taken place. He added that it is interesting that sometimes the opinions on different topics are quite alike, because there are some values that are shared by both parties. In addition, in his opinion the Holy See does not only represent Catholics. He further sees the task of the Holy See to affirm the values common to all of humanity. He noted that examples can be found in the issues of human rights, disarmament, sustainable development and the rights of indigenous groups. Therefore, in his opinion, a lot of principles of Catholic origin have been incorporated into international law.

Regarding the achievement of Millennium Development Goal 6 – combating HIV/AIDS –, Mr Swanepoel stated that the treatment of HIV is of the highest importance for the Pope. One quarter of the HIV/AIDS treatment in the world and hospitals are conducted by the *Church*. He added that the perception of the Pope's comments regarding condoms on his trip to Africa was based partially on a misunderstanding of his words and that the Pope highlighted the fact that solely promoting condoms rather than addressing a holistic approach to the needs of individuals risks exacerbating the problem rather than solving it. Father Bené stressed that the approach of the *Catholic Church* takes into account the entire person and thus provides a holistic response. He mentioned that in Africa condoms had very little success in limiting the spread of HIV and that in Uganda, for example, where the *Church* has promoted responsibility and fidelity in marriage, the number of people infected with HIV has gradually declined for many years now.

The last question related to the status of the Holy See in the system of the *United Nations*, which is dominated by Member States. Our Delegation asked why the Holy See has chosen not to become a Member but to remain an Observer. Mr Swanepoel said that

the Holy See represents all Catholics no matter which country they live in. In addition, it does not want to act through force or vote. Its focus lies on promoting justice. Being an Observer gives the Holy See the opportunity to be neutral and to function as a mediator. It is in the unique situation where it can be friends with Israel and Muslim countries at the same time.

Lucas Skupin

5.13 Visit to the Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations, Mr Roland Tricot

The Delegation of *Freie Universität Berlin* was welcomed by Mr Roland Tricot, Counsellor of the *Delegation of the European Commission to the United Nations*. He explained us how the mission of the Delegation functions. Concerning the structure of the representation of the *European Union* (EU) at the *United Nations* (UN), the European Commission (EC)-Delegation are with the European UN-Member State presiding the European Council the two visible pillars of the EU in New York. Additionally, the European Council represents itself on the ministerial level through the Liaison Bureau of the Council of Ministers. The mission of the EC-Delegation firstly is the co-ordination of the 27 EU-Member States within the UN. One main goal is to speak with a unanimous voice and therefore to avoid three way votes among the 27 countries. With other European States which are no EU-Member States, an influential ‘European bloc’ of about 40 states persists in the General Assembly. In addition, a minimum of two EU-States have permanent seats within the Security Council – France and the United Kingdom. At times, almost a third of the Security Council Members are European countries, currently Austria and Turkey in addition to the two permanent ones mentioned. Thus, European States have quite an influence when working and voting as a single bloc.



Furthermore, the monetary influence was underlined by Mr Tricot. About US\$ 1 billion are made available by the EU and can be freely spent. This amount is an additional, voluntary contribution besides the regular Membership contributions. Regardless of their apparent grandeur and power, the *European Union* itself is not a Member of the UN. As an organisation, the *European Community* has been granted an Observer status which comprises no right to vote on substantive matters. Since the Observer status is the least powerful status, the *European Community* is always the last one to speak during UN-

meetings. This situation might appear slightly illogical since there are certain projects exclusively funded by the European Union dealt with by the General Assembly and other UN-bodies.

Regarding the thematic work of the EC-Delegation in the UN, Mr Tricot presented three of their current involvements. Firstly, he spoke about the *Disarmament Commission* and the *Counter-Terrorism Committee* in whose work he is personally involved. The EC-Delegation's interest is to promote and to implement the *EU Strategy on Counter-Terrorism*. Each year, target countries are being named who receive major funding to establish working structures on terrorism prevention. Currently, these countries are Madagascar and Nigeria.

Furthermore, the EU greatly contributes to international tribunals. The *Court of Cambodia* dealing with the crimes committed by the *Khmer Rouge* in the 1970s was pointed out by the speaker. Overcoming the disapproval of both part of the Cambodian people and the Cambodian Government, the court was established as a mixed tribunal persecuting the crimes both according to Cambodian and International Law. Relatively high salaries for the employed judges were thought to prevent corruption but cannot, unfortunately, eliminate the problem completely. Sixty per cent of the tribunal's funding is assured through the international community, forty percent by the Cambodians themselves. Another example of an international tribunal to which the EU contributes is the *Special Tribunal for Lebanon* dealing with the assassination of former Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri.

Another area of EU participation is the *Working Group on Piracy*. Mr Tricot pointed out that the *European Commission* follows the strategy that real development within the countries of origin of the pirates has to be part of the solution to solve the problem which threatens many countries. Nevertheless, it is an open question whether or not the pirates are going to abstain from piracy and live their former lives as peasants for example. Equivalences to the current high ransoms, up to US\$ 60 million per ship that is released, cannot be paid. He informed us that it recently became necessary to quickly establish an international co-ordination office – which is going to be set up in Djibouti – to handle military operations and implement both local and regional development strategies.

Eventually, Mr Tricot covered various topics while answering our questions. Regarding the world's disarmament engagement, he welcomed the new US disarmament policy announced by President Obama, especially the expression of the will of the US to sign the *Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty* which was negotiated during the era of President Clinton. Nevertheless, he underlined that a world free of nuclear arms will remain unrealistic. Regarding the possible progress within the *Doha Round*, Mr Tricot discussed the possibility of the failure of the last WTO negotiation round because of the agricultural subsidies in the *European Union* and the concurrence in subsidy questions between the US and the EU.

Finally, Mr Tricot highlighted difficulties the *European Commission* experiences within the UN system caused by the representation of 27 Member States. On certain topics, the EC-Delegation strictly sticks to its position as an Observer and does not express an opinion of its own. This for example goes for discussions regarding the reform of the Security

Council. Another question is nuclear disarmament because of the opposing opinions within the EU. No consentaneous position either is expressed on the questions of abortion. Also, regarding the question of a Turkish EU-Membership, the EC-Delegation remains quiet.

Boris Barth

5.14 Visit to the Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations, Ms Fleur Davies and Mr Andrew Rose

On Wednesday, the second day of NMUN, we were visiting the *Australian Mission to the United Nations*. Mr Andrew Rose and Ms Fleur Davies were so kind to spend almost two hours answering all our questions on Australia's international relations and, moreover, they also gave us some helpful tips for the diplomatic behaviour within discussions.



Andrew Rose is the Legal Advisor and works mostly within the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. Fleur Davies is the Counsellor of Development; her main working field is the work with the *Australian Government's Overseas Aid Program* (AusAID), system-wide coherence, humanitarian assistance, and the challenge to reach the Millennium Development Goals. Therefore, we could ask

our questions to two experts in a wide range of topics, which was a good final preparation for the upcoming discussions in our committees.

Before they started to answer our questions in various topics, we got a little introduction on the work of the Mission, where four Australian agencies are represented: The *Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade*, AusAID, The *Department of Defence* and the *Australian Federal Police*, whose main task is to help implementing police in post conflict situations. This shows, and it was stressed again, that one main focus of the Australian work within the *United Nations* is peacekeeping.

In the following hour, we were able to ask all the questions we had and, furthermore, some of Australia's strategies and policies became even more clear and understandable for us. For example, Mr Rose and Ms Davies explained the importance of the CANZ Group (Canada, Australia and New Zealand) to Australia's engagement at the UN.

An interesting aspect of Australia's foreign policy is its relationship to China. A new and better partnership with China began with the change of the government in 2007, espe-

cially because Australia's Prime Minister Kevin Rudd is fluent in Mandarin and spent some years at the Australian Embassy in Beijing, which is helpful for a new growing partnership of the two countries. This new partnership is of an enormous importance for the negotiations for a new post-Kyoto framework. A new agreement will only help, if a solution works globally and is signed by all large countries, especially by China, as it is the largest emerging market worldwide.

Furthermore, Australia's support for freer trade was underlined. Our speakers explained that subsidies and protectionism do not only harm the global community but also each country itself. Therefore, Australia strongly supports the *Doha Round* to minimise especially agricultural subsidies.

A focus was also laid on the different reforms within the *United Nations*. Firstly, we talked about the difference between the UN Reform and the Reform of the Security Council. Australia strongly supports a reform of the UN system, as they hope that a new system, with agencies delivering coherently, will be more efficient and effective than the current structure. Regarding a reform of the Security Council and the distribution of future permanent and non-permanent seats, as they said, they have a realistic perception of the time frame, in which a change like this will be likely to take place. Secondly, Australia is taking a leadership role in the field of Humanitarian Reform, as they will be next year's chair of the *OCHA Donor Support Group*.

The last topic we talked about was the 'Responsibility to Protect', which is highly supported by the Australian Government. The strategy is based on three pillars: First, the responsibility of each country for the protection of its own people. Second, the responsibility of the international community to assist. And third, the intervention if a country fails to protect its people.

Within the two hours, we definitely got a more precise idea of the work of Australian diplomats and we were even more committed to represent Australia and its interests. And with all the tips we got regarding diplomatic behaviour, we were ready to convince all other delegations of the Australian interests. After this session we were perfectly prepared to start negotiations and discussions in the upcoming meeting. We thank Mr Andrew Rose and Ms Fleur Davies for this great final preparation on the interests of Australia.

Miriam Reuschel

6. Australia at the NMUN 2009 conference, 7–11 April 2009

After the preparations in Berlin and the Study Tour at the *United Nations Headquarters*, we were poised for the *National Model United Nations* conference.

When we entered the *General Assembly Hall* for the Opening Ceremony and saw all the other participants, we suddenly became aware of the sheer size of the conference. The Hall was packed with students from all over the world waiting – just like us – for the conference to finally start. At the Ceremony Mr John Holmes, the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, gave us a very interesting speech on his work which summed up what we had learned during the briefing by Stephanie Bunker.

Right after the NMUN Director-General opened the conference, we went straight to our first committee sessions – back at the *Marriott Hotel* – to set the agenda for the days to come. We were also able to meet the other delegations and find our respective partners to start writing resolutions or reports.

Over the next few days, in the course of busy negotiations, we tried to include Australia's views in various working papers, and some of us were able to make speeches. Getting the chance to make a speech, however, took some time in the larger committees, such as the General Assembly. The longest day was the 'Meltdown Thursday'. The committee sessions started at 8.30 a.m. and finished at about 10.30 p.m. Though it was a very exhausting day, it was also the chance to make the most progress on the issues at hand and finally get ready to vote on the emerging drafts.

Each evening, the whole Delegation assembled in one of the hotel rooms for a Delegation Meeting. This provided a great chance to debrief, discuss any problems, as well as to share any funny anecdotes from the committee sessions.

Despite being a little exhausted after NMUN, we were all happy to have had the chance to be Australian diplomats for a few days.

Nicola Shields



6.1. Australia in the General Assembly Plenary

represented by Pete Burgess and Dominik Köhler

After the opening ceremony at the *UN Headquarters*, the delegates met at 8 p.m. to begin the first task before the General Assembly (GA): The setting of the agenda. The topics before the GA were:

1. New Approaches to Nuclear Non-Proliferation;
2. Advancing United Nations Reform; and
3. The Impact of Migration on Development.

For Australia, the three topics all carried significant importance not just in internal and regional politics, but also on a global level. Australia wished to leave the agenda as originally constructed, so in order 1, 2, 3. From the 192 Member States, around 170 of whom were present at the conference, many of the smaller nations were torn between topics 2 and 3. The reform of the UN carried special importance for them as together with one unified voice, they intended to make a strong claim for more equitable representation of nations within the UN. The reform of the Security Council was inevitably one aspect of the reform which was cited in many conversations. When the final vote was cast, the agenda was indeed changed to the order 2, 3, 1 showing signs of a growing dissatisfaction at some of the structural and procedural qualities of the *United Nations*.

Debate resumed on Wednesday at 2 p.m. and a number of speakers were able to bring some issues to the fore that the Assembly then discussed in more detail during informal caucusing sessions which ranged from around 20 to 40 minutes. Australia, together with its regional partners Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia and a number of other Pacific countries, began to work on proposals to reform the working methods of the GA. Proposals included greater effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of the organ, and also touched on greater unity between UN organs, gender mainstreaming and budgetary reform.

A second working paper, concerning the reform of the UN peacekeeping missions, was also raised to our attention. Together with our close partners Canada and New Zealand, we joined a coalition of African and Asian countries. The mandate review was one of the key elements of this working paper. The strengthening of the General Assembly's position within the UN was another theme, with goals to create a more robust and effective peacekeeping system. This was, of course, proposed with respect for the Security Council's primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, but the paper also called for a significant improvement in co-operation between the General Assembly and the Security Council. This concept of improved communication and co-operation was one of the most prominent themes throughout the conference.

Discussion on these topics proved to be very fruitful over the course of the conference in contrast to many delegations that chose to focus their efforts towards Security Council reform. The subject of Security Council reform draws proposals from almost every angle and the success of which demands a complex procedure including an amendment of the UN Charter and the approval and ratification from all 5 Permanent Members of the Security Council.

Thursday saw a shift from the initial fray of ideas towards a more purposeful and co-operative approach as delegates became aware of the time constraint that existed for such a vast topic. Efforts were made to seek support for a rising number of working papers, and many delegates found enough work in just collecting signatures. However, throughout the day as all delegations sought to have their voice heard, there was a lack of willingness from all sides to compromise and merge papers and ideas together. The result of this was that the number of working papers continued to rise past 20, many of those carrying only a handful of sponsors in addition to the remaining signatories required for the paper to be accepted by the dais. As Thursday drew to a close, many of the working groups had begun to focus almost exclusively on their own working, without enough attention being paid to other papers on the floor, many of which were inevitably dealing with very similar issues.

When the chair opened the final day of committee sessions on Friday, there were more than 30 working papers currently being circulated. The chair strongly recommended that the committee start the process of merging papers, warning that when the committee moved later into voting procedure, only around 15 draft resolutions would be accepted. In contrast to Thursday, there was real progress made by the delegations in merging papers and the number of papers began to decrease. Australia continued to look for papers in circulation bearing similarities to the two papers already carrying our sponsorship. We found a group, led by Oman, Kuwait and a number of other Middle Eastern countries, who had also been tackling the topic of GA reform, and we began the difficult but ultimately successful process of merging the two papers. We were also trying to find partners for the draft resolution on peacekeeping. Tensions rose as the committee moved quickly through the final hours towards voting procedure.

By 3 p.m., the GA Plenary entered into voting procedure with 15 accepted draft resolutions. Both papers sponsored by Australia had survived. During voting procedure, which lasted around 3 hours, no delegates were allowed to leave the room and strict decorum was enforced. When we finally left our seats at 6.30 p.m., the committee had adopted 12 of the original 15 draft resolutions, making them resolutions outright. All delegates were delighted to have achieved so much during the week, and have hard results to show for it. There was still, however, one more task awaiting the committee on Saturday.

On Saturday morning, the GA Plenary needed to approve reports and resolutions by the other GA bodies. This session took place in one of the larger conference rooms in the UN. All the resolutions proposed to the GA by the different bodies were accepted, with the board high on the wall to the right of the committee carrying all 192 Member States lighting up predominantly green each time as delegations cast their vote.

The Closing Ceremony marking the end of the conference took place back in the *General Assembly Hall*. With around 2,000 students from over 30 different countries filling the Hall, the atmosphere was one of satisfaction and relief. There was also a great appreciation shared by all delegations for what had been learned over the past week. Friendships had been made and a seed had been planted in each of the young people present, an inspiration to use the many years ahead to courageously endeavour to bring about the change they all wanted to see in the world.

6.2. Australia in the General Assembly First Committee

represented by Florian Lewerenz and Kristina Werner

The First Committee of the General Assembly (GA 1st) deals with issues concerning disarmament and international peace. It resembles the General Assembly (GA), as it follows the same set of operating procedures. Hence, the Committee passes resolutions with a simple majority, or on important matters with a two-thirds majority and with each State having just one vote. The agenda items of the GA 1st are set by the General Assembly, the Committee cannot introduce them by itself. After debating substantive topics, the GA 1st can recommend resolutions for adoption by the GA. These resolutions are considered suggestions, which are to be further discussed in the GA. The non-binding resolutions of the GA 1st do not become official documents until passed by the GA. However, they can indicate the establishment of customs (and eventually be part in establishing customary international law), standards and guidelines for appropriate behaviour. Furthermore, they demonstrate the range of opinions within the international community, indicating which governments support peace and security, and which choose to remain outside of or even impede the development of international co-operative security.

Our agenda issues for the First Committee during the conference were:

1. Upholding the Status of Prisoners of War According to the Third Geneva Convention;
2. Fighting Illicit Trade and Trafficking of Nuclear Material; and
3. Preventing an Arms Race in Outer Space.

All three topics were very interesting, and during our research in Berlin we were pleased to discover that Australia was active in all of them. Nevertheless, we came to the conclusion that the topic of 'Fighting the Illicit Trade and Trafficking of Nuclear Material' was of the highest priority for Australia, as non-proliferation of nuclear material had proved to be a field of strong activism and engagement in the Australian foreign policy.

The conference started with the agenda setting, and after a short lobbying phase, it became clear that many states shared Australia's priority to discuss 'Fighting Illicit Trade and Trafficking of Nuclear Material' first. Thus, soon after lobbying, the Committee adopted the agenda with the second topic to be discussed first.

After the successful adoption of the agenda, the first substantial debate started, and the different delegations lobbied and presented their positions. Our priority with regard to the topic was to strengthen the *Non-Proliferation Treaty* (NPT) and the *International Atomic Energy Agency* (IAEA) in order to prevent illicit nuclear material proliferation. In this context we wanted to refer especially to the *International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament*, an initiative put forward by Australia together with Japan to strengthen the NPT by the 2010 NPT Review Conference. As Australia is the biggest uranium exporter worldwide, another point for our strategy was to enhance technical nuclear co-operation for peaceful purposes in order to improve our export chances of uranium. Finally, we were generally open for all efforts made to strengthen the prevention of a spread of illicitly traded nuclear material.



Together with some of Australia's partners from the *European Union*, for example the United Kingdom, France and others, we began to work on a very comprehensive draft paper. It proposed several measures to strengthen the NPT and the IAEA, e.g. the establishment of regional nuclear fuel banks in order to provide fairer access to nuclear material for all states for peaceful purposes, the creation of

confidence building measures and the supervision of nuclear waste facilities by the IAEA. It also referred to the before mentioned *International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament* as a measure to strengthen the NPT by 2010, which was a crucial point to us. We later merged our paper with another draft from mostly African states to prevent interference and to gain stronger support for the draft. The working paper was later drafted and after some amendments it became a resolution after having passed voting procedure. Finally, it was also adopted as a resolution during voting procedure in the General Assembly on the last day of the conference.

With mostly African states, we simultaneously elaborated a working paper establishing an Organisation of the Nuclear Material-Producing Countries (ONMPC) to oversee the mining, processing, transporting, and storing of nuclear material from exporting countries, under the IAEA mandate. After the working paper was formulated, we lobbied and negotiated for it throughout the Committee in order to get the necessary signatories and guarantee a majority during voting procedure. After the working paper became the first draft resolution on the floor, we had some tough negotiations over some amendments proposed by Greece and others, but we were finally successful in coming to a consensus and so the draft was then adopted by a vast majority of the Committee during voting procedure.

There were ten other draft resolutions on the floor, focusing on diverse aspects of non proliferation of nuclear material, e.g. the creation of Nuclear Weapons Free Zones or an increased funding of the IAEA. Except one, all of them finally passed as resolutions, most of them with Australian support.

Overall, the results of the session were quite satisfying for Australia, with our crucial points included in our drafts and finally adopted as resolutions. On the personal level, it was a very unique and rewarding experience for us, learning a lot about international negotiations, group dynamics and the functioning of the *United Nations* system. We are grateful that we had the opportunity to be part of the *National Model United Nations 2009* and will surely cherish this experience for a long time.

6.3. Australia in the General Assembly Second Committee

represented by Isabell Nagel and Miriam Reuschel

As one of the six Main Committees of the General Assembly, the Second Committee of the General Assembly (GA 2nd) discusses mainly economic and financial issues. Resolutions of the Second Committee are passed on to the General Assembly Plenary. All Member States of the *United Nations* are represented at the GA 2nd. As in the General Assembly Plenary, votes are cast on a 'one country, one vote' basis.

This year's proposed agenda of the GA 2nd was:

1. Climate Change Economics;
2. Economic and Trade Policies to Address Food Price Volatility;
3. External Trade and Micro-financial Assistance to Developing Countries.

All three topics were of great interest to Australia. As one of the largest donors of Official Development Assistance, Australia is eager to help developing countries to strengthen their economic performance. During preparations in Berlin, we prepared Australia's position on all three topics and concluded that climate change was the most pressing and urgent topic on the agenda: it was also directly linked to the others.

On the first evening, the agenda-setting took place. Within the first caucusing of the conference, we succeeded in convincing other states of Australia's preferred order: 1, 2, 3. We really felt that everybody was willing to compromise and work hard during the next couple of days. That evening, we also got the chance to talk to some of our main partners, mainly close allies from Europe, North America and South-East Asia: we found out that most of the countries we talked to had similar priorities concerning climate change. These priorities were mainly:

1. Outlining a concept for the Post-Kyoto Process;
2. Strengthening the idea of Clean Development, as described in the Kyoto Protocol, in the fight against climate change;
3. Addressing the crucial issue of deforestation, which counts towards global green house gas emissions each year; and
4. Drawing attention to new technologies, such as Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS), and the merits of investing in scientific research.

During the five days of simulation we only managed to discuss and vote on the first topic, which was also due to many discussions regarding the speaker's time and several discussions on the call for a suspension of the meeting. Throughout the conference – especially during the informal caucus – we worked hard on two resolutions.

For the first resolution we worked together mainly with our regional partners from the Asia-Pacific area. The resolution aimed to outline a new strategy in thinking about fighting climate change. We were able to stress our most important arguments and projects within this resolution, such as the need for more research on new technologies and the

importance of a fair, holistic post-Kyoto process. Drafting this resolution was definitely long and hard, but in the end our efforts paid off as it turned out to be one of the longest resolutions, as well as one with the most signatories.

On the first day in caucus, we immediately began to collect ideas. We came up with a wide range of issues including: reminding developed countries of their commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; the importance of research into new technologies; clean development; emission trading schemes and natural disaster monitoring. Since we were quite a big group, it took us a day to write



down and structure our ideas logically. Australia was able to contribute a lot towards the clauses on clean development, natural disaster monitoring and particularly regarding the possibilities offered by new technologies, such as CCS. When it came to lobbying, we immediately realised we had a lot of support for our paper and only made some minor adjustments to it in order to even get tougher negotiating partners, such as some of the Middle Eastern countries on board. Furthermore our image of ‘a good international citizen’ also helped us during negotiations with countries, such as Iraq, Pakistan and the Latin American group. When the last day arrived and voting procedures started, we were nervous. The moment our resolution passed, with just three votes against it, we definitely felt proud that this resolution had turned out to be a resolution, which could really – if we were the real UN – make a difference.

The second resolution we worked on focused mainly on the problem of deforestation and was drafted as a more specific and valuable addition to the Asia-Pacific working paper. On this project we worked together with countries from Asia, Africa, Europe and America.

Besides time spent in informal caucus, there were also many speeches by delegations, which were interesting to listen to in order to find out more about the different positions of the delegations. Unfortunately, we were only able to be put on the speaker’s list on place 142 because our note with the request to be added to the speaker’s list got lost the first day. Nevertheless, we were able to stress the importance and the main goals of the two resolutions we were working on.

At the end of the final session, 13 working papers were handed in and became draft resolutions. During the voting procedure on the last day, all of them passed. Even though we were really tired and craved caffeine, we also realised how much work had been done in this committee. Of course the process wasn’t always easy, but as we had made our

way through all the challenges – be it simply staying alert or convincing China how reducing emissions could also be in its interest – we couldn't help but feel a little bit like real diplomats.

6.4. Australia in the General Assembly Third Committee

represented by Santiago Gómez Rojas and Christina Tahamtan

Since in the General Assembly, in accordance with Art. 10 *UN Charter* any question and matter may be discussed within the scope of the *Charter*, the Third Committee is the one of the six Main Committees where delegates may deal with social, humanitarian and cultural affairs.

This Committee was already created during the first session of the General Assembly in 1946. The powers and functions are similar to those of the General Assembly, indeed restricted to its specific issues. The Third Committee plays an important role for the promotion and protection of human rights around the world, as well as for education, and for other matters related with the well-being of the individual and the family. Draft resolutions passed in this Committee should then go to the General Assembly Plenary, in order to be adopted or rejected by the representatives of the nations present in the Plenary.

The topics proposed this year to handle with were:

1. Examining the Uses and Implementation of Technology in Educational and Social Development;
2. Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children in Conflict; and
3. Improving Emergency Response through Humanitarian Reform.

Although all topics were of great interest for Australia, and knowing that the official website of the Australian aid programme released a speech held in August 2008 by Mr Bob McMullan, Secretary for International Development Assistance, in which he stated the reprioritisation of education in the aid programme, we as delegates of Australia decided that the second topic should be more of interest, as the promotion of human rights is a very important issue for Australia. Nevertheless, education is also one of the major topics for Australia in order to promote development, economic growth and stability, specifically in the Asia-Pacific region.

When we came to the first session of our Committee, we were very curious to see in which order the agenda would be adopted. The agenda setting process was very exciting and very hard, because we had to vote on the agenda several times. From the beginning there was no unanimity and after three rounds of proposed orders and voting, the agenda was finally adopted as follows: 'Improving Emergency Response through Humanitarian Assistance' first, 'Examining the Uses of Technology in Education and Social Development' second, and as third and last 'Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children in Conflict'.



Our preferences were clear, but there were many delegates, particularly representing African and Latin American countries, who wanted to continue discussing Humanitarian Reform. Since the first night, we began to find our possible partners to work on a paper. That is why our first approaches were directed to the important partners of Australia: the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Japan and

Indonesia.

We wanted to concentrate particularly in capacity-building in recipient countries, specially focused on natural disaster reduction, rather than man-made disasters and more on prevention through the implementation of the *2005 Hyogo Framework for Action*.

The next day, our work began by exploring the opinions of our partners to know how effective we could work with them.

Since the first moment we faced the barriers of language and culture. Furthermore, there were different interests and it was not very easy to find a common ground to achieve common objectives. The Delegation of the United States wanted to reinforce the role of women reacting in emergency situations and did not show any interest in our strategy, however this idea did not oppose Australia's interests and we promised to work on this paper if they sponsored another one containing our interests.

A compromise was achieved, but later, as we had to concentrate working with other partners, they rejected our sponsorship and removed some of our clauses from the resolution. Nevertheless, we stayed a signatory.

The rapprochement to Canada and New Zealand was harder. The delegates of New Zealand were distrusting Canada, because the Canadian delegates did not want to tell us the topic of the paper, unless we promised them to support it and not tell anyone about the content of it. After a bargaining of 40 minutes aiming to know the intentions of Canada before giving our work, we all finally decided to work separately.

After this disagreement, we concentrated to work closely with the African countries and Japan, other Asian countries and the Pacific islands present at the conference.

Japan was one of the most active delegations proposing several working papers addressing many problems in accordance with Australian interests. We signed every paper of Japan and worked together as sponsors for a resolution addressing the climate change problem related with emergency situations, which included a call to the international

community to work in the creation of an international convention of climate refugees, in order to create international instruments to deal with this problem in the future, when many island-states lose their territory.

For the resolution on climate change-related problems within the Humanitarian Reform process we mainly worked together with the Delegations of Japan and Argentina, but our other allies, such as New Zealand, Canada, Indonesia, a number of Asian-Pacific countries and some other 30 countries signed this resolution. Important for us in this resolution were operative clauses in which we hinted at the urgent need to develop technology designated to evaluate and analyze climate change by focusing particularly on geographical information systems, hazard prediction and early warning systems. We especially mentioned our concerns about the first climate-related refugees coming from the Fiji Islands. We also urged to develop effective mechanisms to exchange views about challenges and achieved objectives. Important for us in the context of climate change is sustainable development through special mechanisms such as the Carbon Capture and Storage Technology.

A very good way to call the other delegate's attention to our interests and proposals was to hold a speech on the second day of the conference where we highlighted issues such as prevention measures, risk identification and mitigation, the cluster approach and our support of the work of inter alia the *Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs* or the *Central Emergency Response Fund*. Strategically very important was that we announced the fact that Australia and its region represent, beyond Africa, the widest and most disaster-prone continent in the world. Mentioning this fact, we received a couple of invitations of not only African countries but also European ones who demonstrated their interest in working with us and invited us for negotiations.

On the second and third day, we worked inter alia with the African bloc and some Arab states on a resolution that deals with the improvement of infrastructure in conflict-affected areas and to find local solutions. The so-called 'rescue me' resolution we worked on, was quite important to Australia since we especially worked closely with the Delegation of Ethiopia, which is a new and important partner in Australia's aid policy and allows to gradually establish relations with other countries on the African continent. Being the bridge between the African countries and Asia on the one hand and the Western countries on the other hand, Australia managed to enhance dialogue between the two blocs and we had a great number of Western countries to sign our resolution.

All in all, Australia worked efficiently with many countries from all continents on this important issue, which was a very good outcome for the debate.

On the last day of debate, we finished the work on the resolutions and had a several hours long voting procedure since our Committee came up with 30 working papers, which resulted in 17 draft resolutions, from which 15 passed.

By and large, the four days of the conference were a unique, challenging and therefore extremely enriching time that we really enjoyed. Even though it was just a simulation, we think that we got quite a good impression of the UN by working with challenging partners making it hard to find common grounds, recognising the challenge to come up with new and creative ideas and co-ordinating our work with several partners at the same time.

6.5. Australia in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

represented by Lucas Skupin and Tadhg Stumpf

The Economic and Social Council created the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) in its resolution 9 (I) of 16 February 1946, in order to pursue drug-related matters. In December 1991, the General Assembly established the *Fund of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme* (UNDCP) in its resolution 46/185.

The CND is the governing body of the UNDCP and consequently analyses the global drug situation. Its work is focused on developing concepts aimed at strengthening the international drug control system in order to combat the world drug problem. Part of its work is to further the implementation of the three international drug control conventions. Its mandate enables it to consider all matters per-



taining to the aim of the conventions. This also includes the scheduling of substances, which are to be bought under international control. Furthermore, it advises the Council on all matters concerning the control of the narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and their precursors. Members are elected from among the Member States of the *United Nations*, Members of the specialised agencies and the Parties to the *Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs*.

During its first formal session at NMUN, the CND focused on the setting of the agenda. There were three topics on the agenda:

1. Role of Narcotics in Fuelling Conflict;
2. Strengthening Alternative Development as a Drug Control Strategy; and
3. Building Partnerships to Address the World Drug Problem.

During informal caucuses the discussions on the order of the topics were held with great verve and it soon became clear that the Commission was split in two blocs – those wishing to first focus on alternative development – and those desiring to concentrate on the role of narcotics in fuelling conflict. Nonetheless, the Commission managed to agree on an agenda setting by the end of the meeting and set the agenda as follows:

1. Strengthening Alternative Development as a Drug Control Strategy;
2. Role of Narcotics in Fuelling Conflict;

3. Building Partnerships to Address the World Drug Problem.

The topic of importance at NMUN 2009 in the CND was Alternative Development as a Drug Control Strategy.

In the course of the negotiations, several main topics emerged and led to a variety of different drafts. Those topics ranged from a focus on educational issues, law enforcement strategies, micro-financing or human rights.

The Australian Delegation has been a supporter of various of these ideas. As we wanted to adequately represent Australia's position, our strategy was to promote human rights and the collaboration with the *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*.

So, initially the focus of our Delegation was the human rights draft. Alongside the Delegation of Finland, we took a fruitful look at the topic of Alternative Development through the perspective of human rights-sensibility.

In the course of the conference, we gathered more and more delegations to support our approach. In the meantime, the Delegation of Australia also negotiated with other delegations and was successful in adjusting several working papers in the direction of the Australian position.

Altogether, there were eight draft report segments in the CND at the NMUN conference. We voted in favour of six of them. We thought that the two other draft report segments were too vague, therefore we abstained in both cases.

In total, we were very pleased with the results of our negotiations. Especially the emphasis on the UNODC as central organising figure can be seen as one of the fruitful results of our mediations, as there were many initiatives trying to lay the general responsibility and funding for alternative development into the hands of regional organisations. We were very content with the CND/1/4 report, which emphasised many of our objectives. Its very human rights focused approach had a very determined framework and was very accurate in fields of interest for the Australian Delegation. Moreover its strategy was multifaceted and considered development focused issues as well as law enforcement considerations. The strengthening of law enforcement and capacity-building has been a field of great expertise and engagement by Australia in the Asia Pacific region. Therefore, the inclusion was of great importance. In total, we can say for ourselves that we had very good, interesting and fruitful negotiations and got along quite well with the other delegations. Fortunately, we managed to include many of our ideas in several of the working papers and definitely managed to further discussions. Working with other delegations turned out to be very interesting and was definitely a great experience.

6.6. Australia in Commission on Sustainable Development

represented by Christoph Berkemeier and Paul Schmidt

The United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) was established in 1992 to ensure an effective follow-up of the *Earth Summit*. The Commission reviews progress of programmes like the *Agenda 21* and the *Rio Declaration on Environment and*

Development. It also helps to implement the *Johannesburg Plan of Implementation* on all levels. At NMUN, the Commission's task was to write a report, which then was introduced to the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

The topics on our agenda were:

1. Management of Biotechnology: Environmentally Sound Technologies;
2. Combating Desertification; and
3. Building Sustainable Human Settlements and Infrastructure.

As we started our research we found out that Australia is quite interested in biotechnology. Australia tries to develop its industry from being commodity-based to one that is based on knowledge. Biotechnology fits quite well in there, because it does not really depend on raw materials and could help to improve agricultural goods. Although Australia is the most arid continent in the world, a significant part of Australian exports are agricultural goods. Biotechnology could help here on the one hand to process agricultural goods into higher value goods, which will generate a greater revenue than raw materials. One example for this are Generation 2 biofuels, i.e. biofuels manufactured from biomass from non-food crops, for which Australia set up a special research and development programme. On the other hand it could help Australian farmers simply stay in business. Some opinions were mentioned, that in such a highly competitive field like the agricultural industry the Australian farmers risk to fall back, if they do not have access to biotechnology. Although not all biotechnology is about genetically modified organisms, it is an important part of biotechnology, at least because it is an ignition point of heated discussions. We researched Australian regulations on genetically modified organisms and biotechnology in general to prepare for such discussions, as we could outline how risk aware Australia is and what kind of big long-term experience we got with biotechnology risk management. The most difficulties we had with the Australian position was that Australia is still into biotechnology. When Kevin Rudd became Prime Minister of Australia by December 2007, the eleven-year-term of John Howard ended. Mr Rudd and Mr Howard do not share many political beliefs, when it comes to ecology and climate change issues. On the one hand, the Rudd government closed the governmental pro-biotechnology website and on the other hand the Australian Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Tony Burke, sees genetic modified organism as part of the puzzle. Australian



farmer NGOs criticised Rudd for the above mentioned, as they consider it as breaking one of his election promises. In the end, we decided to be slightly pro genetic modified organism with the purpose to promote biotechnology in general not only genetic modified organisms.

The next topic 'Combating Desertification' was also quite interesting for Australia, because although Australia is the most arid country in the world, it is also a big agricultural goods exporter. Many of Australia's neighbours and partners are threatened by desertification. We took a look at Australian international foreign aid programmes, agricultural research programmes and our contributions to multilateral agency like *World Bank* or *United Nations* agencies. Australia is very active in research programmes, in which they team up with foreign developing countries and help for example to breed more drought resistant crops. We wanted to push forward the importance of traditional knowledge, as Australia has been highly successful in this area within their own country. Good governance and a call to co-operate with us, were other important corner stones towards combating desertification for Australia. We also wanted to promote forestation as a dual use technology for combating desertification and gaining profits through carbon trading schemes.

On 'Building Sustainable Human Settlements and Infrastructure', we mostly researched Australia's internal policy, as this topic is not very international connected, at least not on a national level. Some Australian initiatives promote solar panel usage, other fight water and energy waste. On the international level, Australia has started the Initiative Infrastructure to Growth, which should help neighbouring countries to build a sustainable infrastructure for a growth of a sustainable economy.

Already at the Opening Ceremony of NMUN 2009 we tried to talk to our main partners and get their positions on the order of the agenda. Our own preference was to have as the first topic number 2 (Desertification), then topic number 1 as a second and at least topic number 3 (Human Settlement and Infrastructure). We did not want to take topic number 1 (Biotechnology) as first, because we saw it as a very controversial issue. After the Opening Ceremony, we had our first session of CSD, and started off with voting on every possible order of the agenda, but none got a majority vote. In a caucus session, we then tried to convince other countries of our preferred order. As it did not lead to a majority for one order, the Commission entered into a second caucus session. This time, our goal was to organise a majority to at least place the topic number 2 first, not caring about second and third order. In the following voting procedure we adopted an order of 2-3-1, which on the one hand made it unlikely that we are going to talk about biotechnology, as it came third. On the other hand, we had secured desertification as the first topic. If the Commission had not come to a decision on that night, we would have had to live with the topics in the given 1-2-3 order. For this day the Commission had only opened the speakers list before we suspended the meeting until the next day.

On the following day we first listened to some speeches and then start caucusing. We were only 53 countries and one observer, nonetheless, caucusing was quite chaotic and it was at first hard to find our partners. There are two basic strategies while entertaining a discussion. On the hand, you can sit down and start writing your own report on your notebook. On the other hand, you can take part in all working papers. There first ap-

proach is a very powerful position and has got the advantage, that you only have to consider other opinions to the point when your report would not pass a vote. The latter approach assures that there is no working paper unaffected by Australia's opinion. We had chosen the second option, as Australia, an Asian European fusion country, would like to be regarded as a mediator in this Commission.

At first, we contacted our closest allies and regional partners, but most of them were not very interested in Australia's opinion. We therefore searched for other options and found some new allies. We especially worked closely together with Tanzania, Italy, Bahrain, Kuwait, Germany and South Africa. These are not very traditional partners of the Australian foreign policy, but at least in our Commission, we developed the most rewarding relations with them. We even tried to include North Korea in our discussions, but they were under very strict orders not to do so. During informal session we were always moved between discussion circles and to make sure that our opinion was part of all of the working papers, so that nobody dropped our lines or even reversed them into the complete opposite. We took part in four out of six working papers on the floor with different partners. One of the working papers was about biotechnology to combat desertification. As said before it was a very controversial issue and we therefore used some time to convince the Members of the Commission. We also supported a working paper about micro-financing to combat desertification. Although we were not sure how this should work out, we supported it to gain support on other more important issues.

The second day passed with not much progress on the speakers list, as we used a lot of time for informal caucus. On the third day, we were able to hold a speech for the first time, followed by a second time late in the afternoon. We then finally merged some draft reports in alternating sessions of informal and formal caucus, which may be would not be able to stand the test of time, but at least would be able to stand the test of the Commission's vote.

On Friday we moved into voting procedure and six draft reports were about to be voted on. All drafts passed except the biotechnology draft report, because some biotechnology industry countries did not like the specific direction the biotechnology draft report took anymore. As there were four hours left, our director motivated us to discuss the next topic. In the end we voted on some kind of draft reports about Building Sustainable Human Settlements and Infrastructure, but the time constraints were very harsh for the this topic. We had invested 20 hours in the first topic and the second topic was rushed through in about four hours.

In the end we were quite satisfied with the outcome. Having in mind that the second report was very much rushed, it is acceptable. The report on the first topic mainly consists of accepted draft papers decorated with Australia's position. The disapproved biotechnology draft paper is not a total loss. The Commission of Sustainable Development did not argue against biotechnology; it just did not make a statement on it. Through our agricultural research programme we can still push biotechnology forward for Australian styled practical solutions.

6.7. Australia in the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

represented by Robert Schmidt and Franziska Weil

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) is the descendant of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) that had been established through Resolution E/RES/37 (IV) in 1947. Back then, colonial powers dominated the Commission but the states in the region were soon able to increase their influence. As the largest regional commission reporting to the Economic and Social Council, today ESCAP consists of 53 Members, including countries in Asia and the Pacific as well as former colonial powers such as the UK, France and the Netherlands as well as further Associate Members.

During the agenda-setting process, most delegations decided to stick with the proposed setting. Our proposed agenda was:

1. Developing Regional Strategies to Combat the International Food Crisis;
2. Investing with Conscience: the Role of Microfinance and Green Business in the Region; and
3. Managing an Aging Population.

Due to time constraints however, we were only able to debate the first agenda topic and briefly touched the second point.

On the first day of our conference, we were introduced to the rules of procedures and some formalities were to be clarified. The major decision made was that one delegate would get the chance to chair the meeting. The debate on the international food crisis started with a formal debate and speeches. Fortunately, most delegates were aware of the importance of the topic in the region and were prepared to work co-operatively. Unfortunately for Australia, many of the Pacific Island States such as Fiji, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands were not present. We were thus lacking some of our most important partners in the region and had to try to gain support for our strategies among other delegates. Also, New Zealand's delegates did not appear very eager to co-operate with their Australian partners. Yet many other delegates were aware of Australia's importance in the region and eager to exchange ideas on how to find short as well as long-term strategies to combat the international food crisis.

Debates often occurred in informal caucusing and delegations with two people had an advantage since delegates could split up and work on different resolutions. For Australia, a few important partners throughout the conference were the Republic of Korea, Micronesia, Indonesia and Turkey.

Two topics that divided the Commission were the questions of whether to completely ban first generation biofuels and how to deal with the problem of biofuels in general. Since second generation biofuels are made of non-eatable plant remains they no longer constitute a threat to global food market prices. Still, their production and use raised some controversy among the delegates, although we were lobbying very much for that technology – keeping in mind its contribution in terms of CO₂ reduction. Another topic that

many delegations found difficult to deal with and that was still highly important to the Australian Delegation was the question of trade liberalisation. We had to negotiate with many other delegations that were strongly opposed to cutting down trade barriers and reducing subsidies. In particular, the presence (and to some extent dominance) of EU countries such as the Netherlands, France and the UK as well as the United States meant this topic continued to be very delicate. Also, some smaller Pacific countries were quite apprehensive.

Ultimately, six draft resolutions were introduced and throughout voting procedure five of them were passed. Many of the draft resolutions dealt with the same topics but focused on specific aspects like improving infrastructure, reducing transportation costs, encouraging regional productivity in agriculture and enhancing agricultural knowledge in the region by sharing technological knowledge. One draft resolution placed a specific focus on the situation and the problems women in the Asian-Pacific region encounter when food prices rise. Australia has been very eager to participate in discussions on these topics and moreover advertising the further liberalisation of trade within the framework of the *Doha Round*. Even if the Australian Delegation was not able to put in a clause referring to the reduction subsidies, the draft resolution that we worked on most contained an admittedly quite weak clause about the promotion of trade liberalisation. The Japanese Delegation tried to cut out that clause during voting procedure but failed to do so.



All in all, Australia was able to promote many of its incentives in the Commission. Although not able to reach all of maximum outcomes, also because of the diverse background of many countries, the Australian Delegation was content with the development of negotiations in the Commission.

We noticed to quite an extent that Australia is somewhat lost in regional diplomacy since it is neither a Member of ASEAN nor regarded as the regional hub for the Pacific or 'part of the family' it sees itself, despite its geographical position in the Asian Pacific region. This cannot only be explained by highlighting Australia's mostly European background since the Asian Pacific influence is increasingly growing.

Yet, since diplomacy is about compromising to a certain extent, we are satisfied with the outcomes that have been achieved.

6.8. Australia in the Food and Agriculture Organization Council

represented by Boris Barth

On the first working day of FAO Council, the delegations negotiated over the setting of the agenda. There were many different combinations of the three possible topics at stake:

1. The Impact of Bioenergy on Food Security;
2. International and Regional Strategies to Address High Food Prices; and
3. The Impact of Water Scarcity on Social and Economic Development

However, the delegations managed to agree fifteen minutes before the closure of the first day's meeting on an agenda. The first one to be treated was: 'The Impact of Water Scarcity on Social and Economic Development' was elected the topic on which FAO Council should work the next three days. On the second day, the negotiations began. The Australian Delegation experienced a few difficulties, which it had to overcome. Since it is a continent of its own, it does not fit into the country alliances best known by the other delegations such as the *European Union* or the *G8*. Also, the countries within the Asia-Pacific region were at first more likely to establish working relations between the developing countries and countries in transition in this region. Australia obviously does not fit into the description of a developing country, and in the beginning, the other delegations were reluctant to fully include Australia into their work.

During the speeches held the second day, the delegations addressed the topic of water scarcity from a variety of points of view: Some stressed the implication of water shortages for the rural development, others focussed on the necessity to take actions on local and regional levels to fight the scarcity and to create awareness for the fact that water is such a precious good. Some put forward their interest in the improvement of wise water use within the agricultural industry, and some focussed on plants for bioenergy which can grow with nearly no water. All these approaches could easily be shared by Australia.



On the third day of work, the Australian Delegation finally created working relations with a variety of countries, among them Zambia, Morocco, India and Bangladesh. Although the first ones are not necessarily very close partners of Australia in reality, it was very interesting to hear the experiences in water management and the ideas for future actions from all these other delegations. For example, the territory of Zambia combines

about 70 per cent of the water in the Sub-Saharan region of which some are transboundary waters. Therefore, Zambia obviously is very much interested in clean water, both for the health of its population and the whole population in the region. This is common interest and major target of both countries. Finally, we started drafting a report focussing on the implications of climate change on water. For some reason, other delegations recommended to divide up the work according to thematic sections (for example Funding or Climate Change) and to point out their implications for and relations with water. Through this approach, a variety of topics linked to climate change such as rising sea levels, the imbalance of atmospheric pollutants and the fight against acid rain in particular, the loss of biodiversity were covered. The Australian Delegation has been able to introduce some of its positions and policies into this draft report segment. The monitoring system between Pacific Island Countries and Australia is referred to in the report. Also, Australia's Water for the Future Plan, the national plan to combat water scarcity and improve water management, is a key point of reference in the document. The mentioning of the necessity to include local and especially indigenous knowledge in the report was put forward by the Australian Delegation. Last but not least, the *Mekong River Commission* as a well working example of transboundary water management is an example from the Asia Pacific region and was introduced into the report by Australia. All in all, the draft report segment Australia worked on was acclaimed by more than a third of the Member countries of FAO Council which sent delegates to the conference.

Eventually, all of the report segments were voted on, none of them were acclaimed unanimously. Some experienced slight changes and adjustments, but the substance of the overall very satisfying outcome of three days of work was passed within FAO. The Australian Delegation is very satisfied with the fact that its positions and points of view mark this report at several points.

6.9. Australia in the United Nations Development Fund for Women

represented by Nicola Shields

The *United Nations Development Fund for Women* (UNIFEM) and is a separate entity within the *UN Development Programme*. At NMUN, the topics up for discussion were:

1. Women's Role in Peacebuilding;
2. Preventing Sexual Violence against Women in Post-Conflict Situations; and
3. Financing Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women During Times of Conflict.

At the first meeting, the initial topic of discussion was the agenda setting. Most delegations were prepared to negotiate but it seemed to be a broad consensus that topic 2 should be first on the agenda. With such a range of agreement, Australia also supported topic 2's being first. In fact, the entire agenda was set at that point: firstly, the issue of sexual violence; next, women's role in peacebuilding and thirdly, financing gender equality. That finance came third on the agenda (and therefore was not ultimately discussed) was a little disappointing for Australia, whose government was the first to introduce gender-

responsive budgeting, which has been adopted by many other governments and is endorsed by the *United Nations*. Nonetheless, discussion of the agenda concluded quickly, particularly in comparison to other committees. With this, UNIFEM began working.

After a few speakers had had their say – Australia being one – it was time for informal caucusing. It is in informal caucuses that most of the work at NMUN is actually done. Very quickly, the geographical reality of Australia hit home: the representatives of *European Union* countries got together, as did the North Americans and the Africans, respectively. While Australia has much to offer in all three topics on the agenda, it works in Pacific Island nations that were not represented either at NMUN in general, or in UNIFEM in particular. Because of this, while other countries automatically sat down together, Australia spent a lot more time finding out what each group was doing. In fact, Australia and the Asian countries formed a group and produced a working paper which was later merged with that of the *European Union*.



The first day was a success and the hard work continued on the second day, during which there were further speeches on the same topic as well as a large amount of informal caucusing. In general, there was a lot of consensus in UNIFEM as the topics are largely uncontroversial and are something which is important for governments to stand behind – and be seen to be standing behind. The

second day resulted in a few working papers on the first topic, including one which Australia had worked on together with China, Laos and Bangladesh as the main partners. After editing by the Chair, the working papers became draft resolutions, which then had to gradually be merged in a process which took a lot more work (and negotiation) than had previously been anticipated.

Finally, towards the very end of the day, two draft resolutions were produced and put aside to be voted upon. With very little time left, discussions began on the second agenda topic, i.e. the role of women in peacebuilding. This continued into the third day. On the third – and final – day, the committee voted on the two draft resolutions in relation to the first topic. Each draft related to different areas and both were passed by acclamation.

In general, Australia's experience in UNIFEM was a positive one, which served to reinforce the message that Australia has a fascinating role to play in international politics, based on a combination of its geography, history and strategic partners.

6.10. Australia in the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees Executive Committee

represented by Gisela Hirschmann and Marlene Micha

The *Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees* (UNHCR) was established in 1949 as a specialised agency of the General Assembly (GA) with its headquarters in Geneva. Its mandate includes the protection of refugees and finding durable solutions to refugee problems around the world.



Moreover, in the *Guiding Principles* of 1998, the UNHCR formally committed itself to the challenge of helping Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) who, unlike refugees, do not cross an international border and therefore are not protected by refugee law. In total, there are an estimated 11.4 million refugees and 24.5 million IDPs. The main legal documents on

which the UNHCR's work is based are the *1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees* and its *1967 Protocol*.

The Executive Committee of the UNHCR is a subsidiary body of the GA and both advises the UNHCR and reviews its programmes. It currently consists of 76 Member States.

On our first day in session, we negotiated the agenda setting. Our NMUN 2009 agenda consisted of the following topics:

1. Return and Reintegration of Refugees and Displaced Persons;
2. Addressing the Refugee and IDP Situation in Chad and Sudan; and
3. Capacity Building in Regions with Refugee and IDP Populations.

As the crisis in Sudan had escalated some days before the conference, with the Sudanese President, Mr al-Bashir, expelling 13 of the most important international NGOs in reaction to the *International Criminal Court* (ICC) issuing a warrant of arrest against him, many countries opted for the situation in Chad/Sudan as the first topic. We nevertheless supported the original order, since we believed it to be more important to discuss the general issue of Return and Reintegration of Refugees and IDPs first, before we could move on to regional cases such as Darfur and Sudan, before moving onto instruments for return and reintegration such as capacity-building measurements. After several hours of

negotiation, no consensus could be achieved among the delegations and the agenda order was left as it was originally outlined by the chair.

On our second day we started to debate on the first topic, Return and Reintegration of Refugees and (Internally) Displaced Persons. There soon were some group dynamics emerging within the Committee, with the United States selecting a group of countries to work on their proposals and an 'African bloc' under the leadership of South Africa. We soon experienced the 'Australian foreign policy dilemma' of being a 'Western' country while being rooted in the Asian-Pacific region. Since our main priority was to reform the UNHCR mandate in order to establish a legal protection framework for IDPs that do not fall under the *1951 Refugee Convention*, we spent the second day drafting our initial ideas and reaching out for potential partners and supporters.

The third day of the conference is referred to as 'Meltdown-Thursday' because of it being the longest day with the most intense debates. We continued to work on our proposals with the surprising support of Nigeria, Turkey, Ireland, and Venezuela. Moreover, we tried to make our idea public through holding speeches, which was difficult considering the large number of delegates – we only got two speaking slots. The United States was the only country who strongly opposed our idea of establishing a working group with the purpose of reforming the UNHCR mandate with regard to IDPs. Israel, however, suddenly got the same idea of establishing a legal protection framework for IDPs and started to work on its own paper.

The final day of the conference was rather hectic due to the deadline for handing in the final drafts that required the chair's approval. With the help of Nigeria, Ireland and a part of South Africa, we managed to get our proposal approved by the chair as draft report segment No. 5. With a huge list of sponsors and supporters, we believed our proposal to be widely accepted, however the tension rose as Nigeria called for a roll-call vote when the adoption by acclamation of our draft report segment failed. In the end, however, our report segment got accepted with a vote of 51 to 2 (with 15 abstentions and 9 countries being absent). This meant that we successfully promoted the idea and even included a reference to our slogan of being a 'good international citizen' and therefore taking up the responsibility to sufficiently protect refugees and IDPs.

The other draft report segments that got all passed dealt with various topics such as enhancing protection mechanisms for women and children as the most vulnerable groups in refugee camps and establishing a global partnership for information sharing in order to avoid duplicating help and also provide a more effective and efficient reaction to refugee and displacement problems. Another segment was called 'Family First' and highlighted the importance of families staying together or being (re-)unified during the return and reintegration process of their respective home countries. The remaining report segments dealt with the refugees' repatriation and the inherent right of voluntary return, strengthening the role of local and regional capacities for protecting refugees and insuring funding mechanism for the programmes installed.

Thus, despite all the different group work going on, we managed to adopt a holistic report that treated all the different aspects of the UNHCR with regard to the return and reintegration of refugees and IDPs. We managed to balance promoting our paper and

meanwhile having a look at all the different proposals, which was not easy at all time. We had to constantly balance the different input given by other delegations to our proposal and meanwhile ensure that the other paper referred to Australia's main concerns, such as the legal protection of IDPs and obligations each state has when trying to be a good international citizen.

After a long preparation phase, we were more than glad that the conference turned out to be an enriching experience in which we not only managed to get our paper passed, but also had a major influence on others and got different perspectives on the topics which we had been dealing with for the last months. It was a unique learning experience which offered one little glance of what diplomats have to do every day: achieve consensus among different nations whose agendas that are both various and also often miles apart from each other.

6.11. Australia in the World Trade Organization

represented by Suleika Suntken and Anne Zimmer

The *World Trade Organization* (WTO) is an international organisation dealing with the rules of trade between nations. The WTO is based on agreements, negotiated and signed by almost all trading nations in the world. Currently there are 153 Member States.

The goal of the WTO is to help trade 'flow as freely, smoothly and fairly as possible'. Its main functions are the administration of the WTO trade agreements, serving as a forum for trade negotiations, handling trade disputes and monitoring national trade policies. It is also providing technical assistance and training for developing countries. Moreover, it closely co-operates with other international organisations like the *World Bank* or the *United Nations* (UN). This is why despite the WTO not being an actual body of the UN our Committee was nevertheless part of the NMUN conference.

On the first day of the conference, we attended the Opening Ceremony in the *General Assembly Hall* and then quickly went back to the hotel where the first session of our Committee was about to begin very soon. Since the hotel elevators were desperately overstrained by the mass of delegates, trying to get to the conference rooms in the lower stories was the first challenge we had to conquer that evening. Finally, having managed to get to the conference rooms the Chair said some introductory words and asked for volunteers for the role of the Page. He then proceeded by starting to check presence of the delegations by roll-call. The next step on the conference schedule was setting the agenda.

Our 3 agenda topics were:

1. Furthering Trade Facilitation Based on the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration;
2. The Relationship between WTO Rules and Multilateral Environmental Trade Agreements; and
3. The Role of Regional Trade Agreements in the International Trading System.

Since we knew, we would not have the time to discuss all topics, it was almost certain that the topic voted to be first on the agenda would be the only one we were going to be able to talk about during the whole conference. Therefore setting the agenda in the preferred order could be very decisive for the outcome of the conference. Our preferred topic was also the broadest termed: 'Trade Facilitation'.



We were interested in setting it to be first topic because trade liberalisation and facilitation constitute the main business of the WTO and Australia can be described as being very much a champion of free and fair trade. As second topic we preferred to talk about Regionalism since the Asian Pacific region is a main focus of Australia. As Multilateral Environmental Trade Agreements are a very complex topic dealing more with legal issues of interpretation matters than with trade issues, we were keen on discussing it as the third topic. Although all possible combinations of order had been proposed, the order we had preferred fortunately was the agenda which finally was being passed. Therefore, the topic we would be dealing with during the conference was trade facilitation based on the Hong Kong Ministerial conference. We then tried to be set on the speakers list which was not easy with the mass of other delegations waving their placards to be set on the list as well. We finally managed to get on the list, but unfortunately with about 100 other delegations before us. The Committee then passed the motion to set a limit to the speaker's time of 45 seconds. In the next caucus we approached some Asian countries and talked about our ideas. Afterwards we approached some European countries since we expected them – together with the United States – to be the strongest opponents to trade liberalisation concerning the issue of cutting agricultural subsidies. Surprisingly, France was very open to discuss cutting agricultural subsidies.

On the second day after roll-call was finished, one of us talked to some more European countries and the other approached the African bloc. In the African bloc, Egypt had already begun to write a working paper and after Australia had shortly explained its point of view on some topics we were asked to write a short text on capacity building and cutting agricultural subsidies which could then be inserted in the working paper. So one of us took her notebook and together with Tajikistan we wrote a text. At the same time during negotiation with the European bloc, the United Kingdom and Belgium were willing to co-operate on a working paper on subsidies as long as it contained a moderate approach to a gradual reduction in agricultural subsidies taking into account the burden of the economic situation caused by the financial crisis and therefore not starting before the year 2013. In the end of the day we gave our other text to Egypt.

On the third day, after roll-call the session started off with a first disappointment: Egypt did not insert our part in the working paper explaining to us that the other African countries did not feel that comfortable with it. So we decided to focus on co-operating with the European bloc because upon being able to find a compromise they would accept seemed the best way for us to achieve progress on the field of agricultural subsidies. Thus, we were working together with France, Belgium, Luxemburg, New Zealand, Latvia and other counties on a working paper calling to gradually cut agricultural subsidies starting in 2013 by 10 per cent and then annually by 5 per cent, for developing countries we demanded a 5 per cent cut starting in 2013 and then a 2.5 per cent cut annually. Finally it was our turn on the speakers list, so we held our 45 second speech encouraging others to work closely with us on cutting subsidies, also mentioning the close co-operation with France, Luxemburg and Belgium and our working paper. In response to the speech we received a lot of feedback and ideas from the Eastern European bloc. Also other developing and least developed countries argued that they would not be able to meet these goals. Especially Serbia and Moldavia expressed their concerns and different views on this topic. We considered the numerous ideas and agreed to include that *'developing countries and LDCs receive a special treatment'*, this refers to *'low and low-middle income states'*.

There were other groups working on an immediate cut of subsidies, which Australia thought about giving its support to, however, we thought this more radical approach might be unrealistic and stuck to our position calling for a rather gradual approach, especially since some developing countries had already told us that they were not able to cut subsidies immediately or in the near future.

During the day we were approached by many countries working on different topics, such as the *Single Window Initiative* (SWI) which basically means one single entry point for all imports thereby cutting red tape and standardising regulations. On this topic we worked very closely with Chile. Australia strongly supports the SWI and we were also mentioned as a role model in Chile's working paper, in the 'Recommendations' part (as Australia organised regional workshops which provide for the exchange of information and provide participants with tools to assist them in the development of their own single windows).

On the last day of Committee session, we started off yet again with roll-call. We then forged the working paper on subsidies with France and Luxembourg, informed and lobbied other countries, discussed further the issue with developing countries and least-developed countries, included an idea put forward by Serbia to create a conference dealing and advising countries that have difficulties with job losses (due to the cut of subsidies) in their new economic situation etc. This was especially supported and demanded by the Eastern European bloc. We included a segment calling for a conference called The Summit on New Industry and Job Creating which would address the needs of Member States that face problems with restructuring their economies. Unfortunately, Belgium suddenly decided to withdraw its sponsorship from our working paper, as they had decided to be a rather neutral state. But our working paper still had enough sponsors to be brought to the chair. We held our second 45 seconds speech calling to support our working paper and repeating that subsidies are a hindrance to free and fair trade and a special burden to developing and least developed countries, lobbying that our working paper

supports this gradual approach which is the only realistic way of proceeding towards cutting subsidies. Now most of the working papers had already been brought to the chair and were now printed and distributed to all delegations, now being called 'draft report segments'. It was hard to manage to read all 14 draft report segments in the meantime since they were most of all five or six pages long and not easy to read. As soon as all draft report segments had been handed out, we went into voting procedure with our working paper on subsidies being called draft report segment 1/7. We voted on the different draft report segments, sometimes by roll-call vote as certain countries motioned to do so. All draft report segments passed except for one, some even by acclamation, some with friendly and some with unfriendly changes. Our draft report segment became report segment 1/6, but to our discontent the unfriendly amendment to change the percentage concerning the cut of subsidies of low and low-middle income states, passed. Surprisingly the other draft report segment which demanded an immediate and radical cut in agricultural subsidies also passed, although the Netherlands reminded the voting delegations that this draft was partly contradicting to the already passed report segment which was ours.

On Saturday, we got to be in one of the conference rooms of the actual General Assembly and the report segments of the WTO were reported to the Economic and Social Council.





**Participation of Freie Universität Berlin in the
National Model United Nations conference 1995–2009**

Republic of Lithuania (1995)

Syrian Arab Republic (1996)

Kingdom of Norway (1997)

Republic of South Africa (1998), Award 'Honorable Mention'

The People's Republic of Bangladesh (1999)

The Republic of Turkey (2000), Award 'Honorable Mention'

The Argentine Republic (2001)

The Republic of Poland (2002)

The International Council on Social Welfare (2004)

The Republic of Guatemala (2005), Award 'Honorable Mention'

The United Arab Emirates (2006), 'Outstanding Position Paper Award', Award 'Honorable Mention'

The Kingdom of Morocco (2007), 'Outstanding Position Paper Award', Award 'Honorable Mention'

Japan (2008), 'Outstanding Position Paper Award'

Australia (2009)

Please contact for further information:

Peggy Wittke (Director)
Model United Nations / Model European Union
Lehrstuhl Univ.-Prof. Dr. Philip Kunig
Freie Universität Berlin
Boltzmannstrasse 3
14195 Berlin
Tel.: +49 – 30 – 838 54705
Email: peg@zedat.fu-berlin.de
<http://www.fu-berlin.de/mun>
<http://www.nmun-berlin.de>

ISBN: 3-927 192-33-3