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“Challenges to the Global Order” was the central theme of the 9th Global Baku Forum held under the auspices of the President of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev and assembling leaders to review critical global, regional and national issues of the day at times when the post-Cold War era is under severe stress. The Nizami Ganjavi International Center has become a significant international center, which explores ways of solution to global problems and informs the world community. It is because of this fact that interest in the events organized by the Center increases from year to year. Representatives of more than 50 countries and reputable international organizations took part in the 9th Global Baku Forum which saw productive discussions on such important topics as key problems threatening the world order, including the prospects of ensuring peace and security in the world, ways of resolution of threats to energy security, peace, cooperation and integration in sensitive regions, growing injustices in the globalized world and transformation of food and agriculture sectors to prevent poverty.

A SCENE-SETTE

Our world, the free world, is changing rapidly, with the values and international order agreed upon after World War II being steadily eroded. Around 75 years ago, new institutions and structures were established based on democratic, liberal, pluralistic values and solidarity between different societal groups and nations. The United Nations was established under the slogan of “never again”. The Atlantic Charter evolved into NATO, conventions on human rights were agreed upon and the Bretton Woods institutions (the World Bank and the IMF) started functioning to create a better world. Some of these institutions and structures and the democratic values are now facing existential threats. Multilateralism, which for many years was the dominant modus operandi of the international community, is being challenged and it conforms with other problematic global trends and phenomena. Some of the changes that represent the challenges arose side by side with, or as a result of, positive developments. Understanding how and why this is happening is crucial for healing. In these times of war and destruction, of tension and crisis, of human suffering and political challenges, the NGIC has redoubled its efforts to promote discussion with political leaders and international organizations, organizing on site missions on the humanitarian situation with Ukraine refugees, technical conferences, as well as political conversations with key decision-makers. The 2022 meeting comes at a time when challenges facing humanity are reaching new peaks. A time when there is a need for NGIC to bring the wisdom and experience of its distinguished members and participants in an open and unconstrained debate to learn from the past, assess the present, and envision the future.
The President of the Republic of Azerbaijan Ilham Aliyev hosted the opening ceremony of the Forum at Gulustan Palace and declared open the 9th Global Baku Forum with his following address:

“The 9th Global Baku Forum opens today and I am sure that the discussions as always will be very productive, because we have a great audience. Members of the Nizami Ganjavi International Center and the guests participating in the forum, I am sure, will contribute to a very open and sincere discussion on the most urgent issues on global arena. And I am sure that discussions and also exchange of views will help to elaborate new approaches towards the resolution of the issues which are on the top of global agenda. During its activity the Nizami Ganjavi International Center transformed itself into one of the leading international institutions addressing global issues and managing to embrace the broad international community. We met yesterday with the members of Board and I was informed that at the 9th Forum we have high-level representatives from almost 50 countries. This is much more than a year ago. So, this demonstrates the attractiveness of our discussions. This demonstrates that this platform is needed and it’s very useful. It has a very important practical impact, and I am sure what will be discussed these days in Baku and also in Shusha on Sunday will be important for decision-makers. Because elaboration of new approaches is needed today maybe as never before, I’d like to express gratitude to the co-chairs of NGIC Madame Vike-Freiberga and Mr. Serageldin for their outstanding contribution to the transformation of the Center and the Global Forum which I think is now in the top list of international fora. Also, I would like to express gratitude to all members of Board for their active role in this transformation. When I talk about new approaches, it’s clear that the world has changed since we met last November 2021 here in Gulustan Palace. The change is fundamental. When I talk about new approaches, it’s clear that the world has changed since we met last November 2021 here in Gulustan Palace. The change is fundamental. We have so far unpredictable consequences, but it’s clear that the world will be different, and it is already different. Therefore discussions, exchange of views, sometimes contradictions of different opinions, that’s what is needed in order to elaborate new approaches. Every country, of course, should contribute to that, first of all, with respect to security measures, because issues of security now become the top issue on international agenda. At the same time, I’m sure that open discussions about the current situation in Europe is needed. The Global Baku Forum is an excellent platform for that. It’s an inclusive forum which accumulates opinions from different sides, and I think that’s how it should be. Because we all need to work closely
in order to make the world safer and more secure. At the same time, I am sure that one of the issues on the agenda is what will be the role of leading international institutions, what will be the role of leading financial institutions in coping with the food crisis, because it is inevitable, and it is already next door. International organizations and leading countries also should take care of situation with the potential growth of migrants which will be a consequence of food crisis. If we add here the situation on the energy markets which is a very unpredictable and which also leads to disparity between producers and consumers, and this is a risk also for producers. If somebody thinks that country-producers of oil and gas are very happy with these high prices, it's a wrong assessment. The balance of interest between producers and consumers in a stable market, that's what producers really need and the efforts of OPEC Plus where Azerbaijan actively participates were aimed at that. So, all these are new challenges. What I am saying now is absolutely different from what I was saying six months ago sitting in this place. It shows that everything can change, everything changes, and nothing is stable. Of course, as President of Azerbaijan I work on the issues related to security of our country and the resolution of the Karabakh conflict, I think, is an opportunity for security in the region, for peace in the region. Last time when we met, I broadly covered the issue related to occupation, devastation and humanitarian crisis which our people suffered for almost 30 years. I don't want to repeat that. It is known already, because there are so many visitors to the liberated territories -- politicians, public figures, journalists, representatives of civil society -- and they see all with their own eyes what ruins were left after Armenian occupation. I am grateful to Nizami Ganjavi International Center that last year they organized one session in Shusha and we had an opportunity to meet there. I was actually working as kind of a guide to our guests showing them the situation. Therefore, I want to express our approaches to the post-war situation, to the situation related to post-war security in the Caucasus. Azerbaijan won the war. The war was just, the war was inevitable, and it led to restoration of justice, international law, and national dignity of the Azerbaijani people. Now we talk about peace. I think it's one of the unique cases in the world that after such a long-lasting confrontation within a short period of time the country which restored justice and defeated the aggressor offers peace. If you look at the history of wars not in many cases can one see this picture. But why do we select peace because we want stable, sustainable development in the Southern Caucasus. It's a unique opportunity. Southern Caucasus was disintegrated throughout the years of independence of three countries of Southern Caucasus. For thirty years it was disintegrated because of Armenian occupation. So, now it's time to establish peace, establish cooperation. And Azerbaijan is working on that. With respect to process of normalization of relations with Armenia, we suggested, it was our proposal to start working on a peace agreement. Armenia did not respond. Then we made another step, we put forward five basic principles of international law, including mutual respect to and recognition of territorial integrity of both countries and mutual refrain from any territorial claims now and in the future, and other principles which make the bulk of our proposal. We were glad to see that the Armenian government accepted these five principles. So, this is positive dynamics but now we need to move to practical implementation. Because we know from the history of times of occupation when we were negotiating that sometimes words even on high-level articulated by Armenian officials do not mean a lot. Because we need steps. Azerbaijan already on its side established an Azerbaijani Commission on the Peace Agreement and we expect the same to be done by Armenia. As soon as it is done, or if it is done, then negotiations will start. We also put forward a proposal to start the process of delimitation of our border because the biggest part of our border was also under occupation and never a delimitation took place. Therefore, this process also has started, and the first joint meeting of the border commissions of Azerbaijan and Armenia took place last month on the border. That was also symbolic that both sides met on the border and that was also an important message that there will be progress. Of course, we understand that it's a long way, but it started. At the same time, we expect that Armenia will comply with the Trilateral Declaration signed on 10 November 2020 with respect to the opening of communications for Azerbaijan to have a connection with its Autonomous Republic of Nakhichevan. Unfortunately, it's more than one and a half years since Armenia signed a capitulation act, but so far there is no access. And this is unacceptable. First, this is a violation by Armenia of the provisions of Trilateral Declaration,
and it also creates a kind of imbalance in the region, because based on the same declaration, Azerbaijan undertook the obligation to provide unimpeded access from Armenia to the Karabakh region of Azerbaijan where Armenian populations live. So, for one year and a half Armenians are using the Lachin corridor to have this unimpeded connection, but Azerbaijanis cannot use the road through Armenia, the Zangazur corridor, to connect us with Nakhichevan. This is not fair, and this is not just. We will never agree with that. Therefore, I think that the deliberate delays from the Armenian side of giving us this access is counterproductive. It reminds me of the times of negotiations when Armenia was delaying and delaying and just winning time. What was the result of that? The result was total defeat on the battlefield and in the political arena. The result was that Armenia’s ideological basis was totally dismantled. Almost 30 years of occupation did not make Armenian people happier. On the contrary they have been known by the world community as occupants and aggressors. Now, after the war ended, everybody can see what ruins they left during the times of occupation. Therefore, the soonest resolution of the opening of Zangazur corridor is one of the fundamental elements of future peace in the region. If we are not given this access, then it will be difficult to talk about peace and all efforts of Azerbaijan aimed at normal coexistence and normal neighbourhood with Armenia will fail. This is an important issue again. Azerbaijan has a right to demand it. The Armenian government signed a corresponding declaration. Second, Azerbaijan won the war as a country which suffered from occupation, and we have a moral right to demand it. Another issue which I want to draw your attention is issues related to Armenians who live in Azerbaijan. I think that the declaration which was announced by President of the European Council Charles Michel as a result of a trilateral meeting in Brussels between President Michel, myself and Prime Minister Pashinyan clearly states that the rights and security of the Armenian population in Karabakh also will be taken into account. We fully support it. Rights of security of all people of Azerbaijan are provided by our Constitution. Azerbaijan is a multi-ethnic country, and the Armenian population is not the biggest ethnic minority in Azerbaijan. Therefore, our Constitution provides equal rights for representatives of all ethnicities, including Armenians who live in Azerbaijan for many years. Therefore, we will, of course, take care of their rights and security but, unfortunately, we start to hear from the Armenian government words about the status of the so-called “Nagorno-Karabakh” which is absolutely counterproductive and dangerous for Armenia itself, because Nagorno-Karabakh does not exist! The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous District was abolished in the end of 1991 by the decision of Azerbaijani Parliament. We don’t have this administrative structure on our territory. Therefore, any kind of reference to the so-called “status” will lead only to a new confrontation. The Armenian government should understand it and should refrain from attempts to re-write history. History is already here. It was a kind of verbal agreement that no one will talk about the status. Unfortunately, it happens, and can lead to very serious consequences, because if Armenia continues to put under question Azerbaijan’s territorial integrity, then Azerbaijan will have no other choice but also put under question Armenian territorial integrity. And from a historical point of view, we have many more rights to do it because the history of the last century clearly shows that in November 1920, six months after sovietisation of Azerbaijan, the Soviet government took a historical part of Azerbaijan -- Zangazur -- and adjusted it to Armenia. Therefore, if Armenia demand status for Armenians in Karabakh, why shouldn't Azerbaijanis demand equal status for Azerbaijanis in Western Zangazur because it was fully inhabited by Azerbaijanis? So, this way will only lead to a deadlock, and I think the Armenian government should not forget the lessons of the second Karabakh war and learn that lesson well while refraining from any kind of territorial claims on Azerbaijan. Another issue, which I also want you to know, is speculations about the activity of the Minsk Group. The Minsk Group was created in 1992. The mandate was to help to resolve the conflict, but de facto activity led to zero result. Can you imagine? For 28 years a group which has a mandate from the OSCE didn’t produce any result and therefore, after Azerbaijan resolved the Karabakh conflict, the need for this Minsk Group activity is no longer here. And we think that everybody understands it. Especially, after the Russian-Ukrainian war, it is clear that the three co-chairs of the Minsk Group cannot get together and we already received these messages that the Minsk Group will not, I mean the co-chairs of this group will not function; in other words, the Minsk Group is dysfunctional. Therefore,
any attempts of revival are also counterproductive. I think the best way is to say “goodbye” to the Minsk Group, not “thank you and goodbye”, but only “goodbye”, because 30 years is enough! It is time for retirement. So, I also want to express our position that any kind of speculations in Armenia or in any other country about the Minsk Group lead only to irritation in Azerbaijan. We resolved the conflict. The so-called Madrid Principles, which were elaborated by the Minsk Group, have been resolved and now we need to think about how to normalize relations with Armenia and sign a peace agreement. I think we can, if both sides work in good faith, sign this peace agreement within one year. Then, the peace will come to Caucasus and our vision for Southern Caucasus is cooperation and integration. Azerbaijan already made on several occasions proposals to start, to make a first step. We consulted on this issue with our Georgian colleagues and the Georgian government is also supportive to this idea to organize a trilateral meeting on the level of foreign ministers of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia in Georgia and to start this dialogue. Unfortunately, Armenia refuses. I don’t know what the reason for that is. I cannot find any reasonable explanation. The same attempts were made, as far as I know, by some European institutions. Again, there was a refusal. If Armenia does not want to have peace in the Southern Caucasus, then there is a question, what do they want? If they want another war, it will be a catastrophe for them, and they clearly understand it and I think that the government and the revanchist forces in Armenia clearly understand that that will be the end of their statehood. Therefore, I think we need to get a clear answer from Armenia. How do they see the Southern Caucasus? Our position is clear. The position of the Georgian government is clear. We want to start this dialogue, start this interaction and, of course, without Armenia it will not be possible. Especially when taking into account the current sit-
-vation, there is a need, also, to address issues of regional importance related to ecological protection, trans-boundary rivers, which create a lot of pollution in Azerbaijan, issues related to transportation, new opportunities with respect to transit, especially considering that Azerbaijan is now coming closer to completion of its portion of the Zangazur corridor. The new routes, energy security can also be part of that. So, I think it is time to start, because we lost 30 years and if not for Armenian occupation, I think the Southern Caucasus today would be a very dynamic and modern region with a bigger economic potential.

A couple of words about energy security because it is one of the urgent issues on global agenda. Demand for Azerbaijani energy resources is growing. This February 4th here in this Gulustan Palace we held the annual meeting of the Southern Gas Corridor Advisory Council. We were just planning our future steps, but the situation in Europe has since changed dramatically. Therefore, the need for Azerbaijani hydrocarbons is growing and we are trying to do all what we can in order to satisfy the growing demands from many countries. We received, during the last couple of months, requests from many European countries with respect to the gas supply and, of course, it is not easy, because first we need to produce it and we were not planning to increase gas production. Therefore, now we are working with the European Commission on this issue. We started an energy dialogue with the European Commission, which covers not only gas, but also oil, electricity, and hydrogen. There is great potential in Azerbaijan in renewables. We discussed it yesterday broadly with the members of the Board and we already started. We are planning to continue these efforts and already more than 700 megawatts of wind and solar generation will be in operation within a year and a half. But this is only the beginning. The potential is much greater. Already we signed preliminary agreements with respect to 4 gigawatts of renewable energy and the potential alone of the Caspian Sea is 157 gigawatts. So, it is a huge amount. Azerbaijan without any doubt will transform itself into a green energy zone, and into a serious player on international energy markets with respect to renewables.

I want to conclude my comments, saying once again welcome and thank you for being with us and wish the Forum success. I am sure that will be the case, as usual. Thank you.”
The former President of Latvia and co-chair of the Nizami Ganjavi International Center, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, thereupon spoke about the current geopolitical situation in the world and stressed the necessity of uniting efforts globally to eliminate conflicts and prevent wars: “We were warmly welcomed by the President of the country, who is the host of the IX Global Baku Forum. We would like to thank Mr. President for his time to address this audience and clarification of the important historical events from the moment Azerbaijan managed to liberate its territories to the present day. The hope he gives to the people who lost their homes, territories and native lands is, of course, encouraging. Steps taken in the direction of securing peace between Azerbaijan and Armenia are commendable while highly appreciating the efforts of the European Union in this regard. Positively assessing Azerbaijan's approach to the resolution of conflicts globally, she said: “I think that the key points we heard from President Aliyev defines the way we look at the crises we have.” Sharing the views of the former President of Latvia, the co-chair of the Nizami Ganjavi International Center, Ismail Serageldin, added the following: “Taking this opportunity, I would like to thank President Aliyev for creating the space of freedom that he has provided for us over the years both in the Global Baku Forum and in other meetings of the NGIC. We are under his auspices. We have always felt free to explore, to listen to the diversity of views and to hopefully come up with sound ideas from people of experience and good will.” The President of Albania, Ilir Meta, stressed the necessity of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the fair resolution of problems on the international level. He called on the world powers to increase their international efforts in order to prevent wars. Thanking the government of Azerbaijan for the conditions created for such discussions, President Meta said: “I take the opportunity to express once again my gratitude for the support provided by Azerbaijan and President Aliyev for the successful implementation of Trans-Adriatic Pipeline and Ionian-Adriatic Pipelines in Albania and in our region.” Stressing the necessity of joining forces in fighting the pandemic, strengthening global integration and expanding cooperation, the President of Albania again thanked the organizers for this important event in Baku.
The President of Georgia, Salome Zurabishvili shared her views on peace, security, fundamental human rights and shortage of food and energy. Stressing that establishing peace in the South Caucasus is one of the key issues nowadays, she said: “I welcome the participation of the European Union in the peace talks and the confidence building process between Azerbaijan and Armenia”.

The Chairman of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Šefik Džaferović, highlighted during his speech: “Dear President Aliyev, I wish you success in the efforts of restoration of Karabakh. I wish you success in the full implementation of the agreements you achieved following the second Karabakh war and the protection of Azerbaijan’s territorial integrity within the framework of international law”. He underlined the importance of cementing international cooperation to make sure that our future world is without conflicts and safe. With specific facts, he stressed the necessity of conducting reforms in the UN.

The Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO), Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, also expressed satisfaction with his participation in the discussions. He said that although a lot of work had been done in the world to ensure vaccination, it was not enough yet. Stressing the necessity of fundamentally improving the international healthcare system “As the WHO, we should highly appreciate the efforts of Azerbaijan in fighting the pandemic. I am very happy to see that the infection and mortality rates in Azerbaijan are at the lowest level since the onset of the pandemic”. The Director-General of the WHO stressed that the heavy consequences of wars adversely affect the world healthcare system, as well, and added that specific actions should be taken in this regard.
The former Prime Minister of Turkey, Binali Yıldırım, brought to the attention of the participants with concrete facts that consecutive and systemic work had been carried out in Turkey in order to restore international justice. Emphasizing that the South Caucasus should turn into an arena of peace, friendship and cooperation, he underlined that “There are many examples of that. No result had been achieved in the resolution of the Karabakh conflict over 26 years despite the attempts made by the UN, the OSCE Minsk Group and other international organizations. However, Azerbaijan liberated its occupied territories with its own resources and power following the 44-day Patriotic War”.

The Director-General of the United Nations at Geneva, Tatiana Valovaya, thanked the Nizami Ganjavi International Center for approaching the discussion of issues concerning the world with special sensitivity and President Ilham Aliyev for creating the conditions for discussing such issues as climate change, food safety and others. Stressing that the pandemic has more distinctly revealed social injustices across the world, the international community must intensify efforts to cope with this problem successfully and spoke about the work done in order to carry out the responsibilities of the UN in this direction. She said that there is much more to be done to eliminate the consequences of COVID-19 on our planet.
The eighth Secretary-General of the Arab League, the former Foreign Minister of Egypt, Ahmed Aboul Gheit, said that the topic of the Forum is important for discussion. He thanked the President of Azerbaijan for the continuous support for the Global Baku Forum and his hospitality and remarked: “Let me, first of all, briefly address President Ilham Aliyev, Mr. President, it is the first time I have participated in the Baku Forum. I have been to this city three times as foreign minister. Last, I was here in 2009. But, I have to tell you, Mr. President, how much I have been admired by the development of the city. You have turned it into a big and modern city, and I welcome your achievements”. The former foreign minister of Egypt stressed the importance of taking required steps to achieve peace and build a safer world amid crises and uncertainties in the world.

Speaking at the end of the opening panel, the co-chair of the Nizami Ganjavi International Center, Ismail Serageldin, wished the Forum success and exclaimed: “Mr. President, we should have the courage to dream, and we should believe in the power of our dreams, but we need to take root in the realities of the present day and the future. We should make sure that we can move from conflict to peace, from fear to safety and from national security to human security at a time when all of us go forward in order to live in a greater diversification… Mr. President, you have given us this space and freedom at the Global Baku Forum and we are looking forward to having discussions on diversification by trying to be worth of the wisdom of our ancestors and probably making contributions to the generations that will come after us. But saying so, Mr. President, I we would like to thank you for allocating so much time for us and declare the Global Baku Forum officially open. We hope to be together with you and report to you at the end of the Forum. Thank you. I declare the session closed”.
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The letter of Prime Minister of the UK

Your Excellency,

Congratulations on the opening of the 9th Global Baku Forum. Thank you, once again, for providing this crucial opportunity for the leaders of the past, present and future to consider the most pressing challenges of the day. I commend your decision to make Russia’s illegal and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine the headline issue at the Forum. Russia’s assault against Ukrainian territorial integrity is an assault on global peace and security. The brutal killing and wholesale destruction in Mariupol and other Ukrainian cities offer a dreadful vision of the future: abandonment of international law and disrespect for the sovereignty of independent states. The consequences of Russia’s actions will have far-reaching consequences for the security and the wider world – we need only look at the impact on global food security of Putin’s despicable blockade. We must respond together, arming the brave defenders of Ukraine, providing vital humanitarian and economic assistance and ensuring Russian withdrawal from Ukraine.

You have also highlighted the question of energy security and transformation. We are now approaching the most intensive phase of two parallel reconfigurations of our energy supply. We need to cut our ties with Russian fossil fuels. Alternative suppliers, such as Azerbaijan, have a vital role to play. At the same time, climate change is no longer a theory. The reality of hotter, drier more volatile weather is damaging habitats and ending lives around the globe today. To stave off the worst future effects of climate change we need to deliver on net zero as rapidly as possible by a swift shift to renewables. These twin drivers of change will deliver a massive investment in renewables in the next months and years. Aside from the Forum, I know that Azerbaijan has enjoyed a successful year re-opening for business after the pandemic, successfully hosting the Euro 2020 football tournament and Formula 1. Your armed forces showed their courage and ability to operate alongside NATO in Kabul, where they stood in support of coalition forces to guard the airport until the last moment. The development of the Western provinces of your country recovered in 2020 is rightly a major goal for your nation. There are opportunities for these provinces to emerge as centres for cultural exchange, green technology and innovation. But post-conflict contamination remains a barrier. Landmines and other munitions have scarred these provinces. I am delighted that British mine clearance experts and companies are working alongside Azerbaijani colleagues to remove the threat. It would be a great step towards reconciliation and the successful resettlement of those lands – and would show regional leadership – for Azerbaijan to commit to lay no new landmines, and signature of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty.

Please accept my best wishes for a successful Forum.
The letter of President of Italy

Your Excellencies,

I have received Your kind invitation to the Ninth Edition of the ‘Global Baku Forum.’ I regret to inform You that I shall not be able to take part in this initiative due to institutional commitments already in my schedule. I am sure that this year too the meeting will provide a useful opportunity for reflection; the topic You have chosen, “Challenges to the Global Order,” is a testimony of that intention.

The present context - marked by the economic and social aftermath of the pandemic and by the terrible consequences of the Russian aggression against Ukraine - requires we face the responsibility of promoting with even greater determination the values of dialogue and collaboration among peoples. Owing to the reappearance of the threats of imperialism and militarism, paired with the risk of a progressive unraveling of the international order, initiatives like the one in Baku wield an even greater prominence. These initiatives are based on the respect of diversity, the systematic interaction with other cultures and the recognition of the equal dignity of the other, all these being essential elements for safeguarding global peace and stability. In renewing my deepest appreciation for Your activities and in offering You my heartfelt wishes of success for the forthcoming “Global Baku Forum,” I avail myself of this opportunity to convey to You my best regards.

VIDEO MESSAGE FROM PRIME MINISTER GORDON BROWN

“Though I am far away and at a distance, I feel very close to the work for justice that NGIC is doing. NGIC has a special role to play in healing our fractured world. For even amid we must strive for peace. Even where there is division we must work for dialogue; and even in tragic inconstancies where nations are violently pushed apart, we must attempt to bring them together and, yes, even when old bridges are being blown up, we at NGIC must try to build bridges anew together. Friends, we must never act from fear, but we must never fear to act and if anyone is in any doubt about the strength and depth of support for the people of Ukraine, I say without equivocation: let them come to Global Baku Forum. At this great event bringing together national leaders and the leadership of international institutions from the WHO to the WTO, the world see and hear at first hand our undying admiration for the courage of all the people of Ukraine. Courage is the greatest quality of all, for upon it all else depends; you can be eloquent, intelligent, innovative, creative, kind and generous, but without courage, nothing is possible. Lives have been broken, but the spirit of Ukraine is unbreakable. Buildings and homes have been destroyed, but the unity of the people of Ukraine is indestructible. Putin may conquer land and territory in Ukraine, but he will never conquer the hearts and minds of the people of Ukraine. We have a moral responsibility to do more in aid of Ukraine and justice; for none of us can be at ease when Ukraine is ill at ease, none of us live in comfort when millions of displaced Ukrainians live without any comfort, none of us ever be content again when murder, rape and intimidation cause massive discontent. And so we owe it not just to Ukraine but to the cause of a civilized world, to not only extend sanctions and travel bans and not just to step up the supply of weapons and humanitarian aid but to promise in the clearest, most unequivocal way possible: we will never tolerate or acquiesce in one country replacing the rule of law by the use of force against another country, and so we will bring to justice those who have committed war crimes, and while the international criminal court takes evidence of crimes against humanity, the quickest and cleanest way to indict President Putin and those responsible is to arraign them before the special war crime tribunal that the Ukraine government has requested - modelled on the trials of Nuremberg of 1946 - for the initial crime, the foundational crime obvious to the world - the crime of aggression. And then the message will go out and reverberate across the world... that never again will aggression triumph over peaceful negotiation, and never again will law-breaking replace the rule of law, never again will impunity reign when such injustice is done. Not only war, but famine now threatens our world: 800 millions of our fellow global citizen's without enough food to avoid going hungry, 300 millions under direct threat of starvation and all this layered on top of Covid, a new energy crisis, a new debt crisis, depreciating currencies in crisis... and the droughts, heat waves, floods and melting of ice that climate changes brings:
Multiple crises - now, 100 million people displaced looking for homes they do not have, and 60% low income countries in debt distress and for the first time. I remember oil prices and food prices rising, the majority of the world seeing their standard of livings fall. In desperate times after the second world war came the Marshall Plan, which reconstructed a war-ravaged Europe. An oil shock in the 1970s brought the creation of the G7 and a commitment to manage global currencies. Out of the global financial crisis of 2008, a new G20 leaders group agreed on a trillion-dollar stimulus to end the threat of depression. But now the G20 seems more like a G Zero and we seem to be on the way to a one world-two systems future and as a result a leaderless world. Churchill, one of my predecessors, summed it up when he said of the 1930s as he could say now “we are resolved to be irresponsible adamant for drift, solid for fluidity and all powerful for impotence”.

Let me say we are at the mercy of three seismic global shifts that are moving us from one era that has gone to another... from a unipolar to multipolar world, from hyper globalization to globalisation lite, from the neoliberal Washington consensus where economics dictated political decisions to now today politics dictating economic decisions and we cannot afford to sleepwalk throughout what will become a devils decade of recession, protectionism and aggression like the aptly named protectionist 1930s. We have to understand that 82 countries, continue to be defenders and abstainers and thus enablers of Russia’s violation of human rights, and a far larger catalogue, 155 strong, including the whole of Africa, and Asia, and most of Latin America and the Middle East have refused to impose sanctions. We have NATO unity but global disunity. But these countries are not walking away from the West for the love of Russia. While they highlight double standards - Western concern for Ukraine but lack of concern for those affected by conflicts in the south - their biggest grievance is that a Western-led globalisation has failed to deliver for their citizens and appeals more like a runaway train that has careered out of control and is uncontrollable. Parallel crises make the future perilous, but we are not powerless. Even amidst war, we have to prepare for the greatest peacetime task of all: to rebuild our post 1945 international institutions for today’s world, the first test being whether we can come together as a G20 or under the UN to deal with the energy, food, debt and currency and continuing Covid and climate crises not in isolation but as part of a comprehensive plan to deal with the biggest enemy of all - poverty, deprivation, starvation, squalor, pollution and inequality.

An agenda that repositions the IMF - too narrowly defined today as the safety net for countries in trouble - as responsible for the surveillance of the world economy could advance recovery and growth in both the developed and developing countries. Recapitalizing the World Bank, now seen principally as the adviser to the poor, to become the delivery agent for global public goods and in partnership with the UN, the financier of humanitarian aid could demonstrate that our institutions can cope with today’s global emergencies. In such a renewal and reform of the global architecture, the World Trade Organization would be empowered to be the scourge of ‘beggar-thy-neighbour’ protectionism. Working together - the UN and COP processes - could deliver a concerted and properly coordinated push to net carbon zero. And an enhanced G20 that finally included the developing world would achieve the representativeness and thus the legitimacy it needs to be effective as the premier decision-making forum for the global economy.

Narrow adversarial nationalism can be defeated once we understand that in this new world, every country’s independence is limited by its interdependence. But realising that imperative will require us to make a case for the alternative future that balances the patriotism each nation values with the cross-border cooperation each nation needs; let us recognise that peace does not happen by accident but has to be won by effort and determination, that prosperity to be sustained has to be shared, and the international cooperation murdered by those who would fight wars has to be reborn...and here in Baku is the place to start.”
The war in Ukraine has totally exposed the weaknesses of the multilateral system, which was unable to deter all-out war. The limitations of international action have limited the ability of the peoples of the world to translate their sympathies for the Ukrainian people into effective actions. The presence of nuclear bombs in the background acts as a check against other nations’ involvement on the side of Ukraine in this lopsided confrontation. But this war is different than other wars: it is taking place in the heart of Europe, and in an era where international media and hand-held telephones as much as satellite photography are recording and broadcasting all the action almost in real time. The reality of war has become visible to all who have access to the internet. The reality of war is not only destruction and killing, but also refugees. In this case, about 5 million Ukrainians have crossed the borders to other European countries, not counting the internally displaced persons (IDPs) who have left their homes in the north, east and south of Ukraine to flee the bombs by going towards the west of the country. The terrible toll of the war in destroyed buildings counts for little when compared with the toll in destroyed lives, between the many soldiers and civilians killed and the families that have been ripped apart. And beyond all that lies the unmeasured impact all this is having on the mental health of all, but especially children. The shield of the international order has not been able to safeguard the fundamental rights of the people of Ukraine. How this war will end will also raise the question of how the brave people of Ukraine will rebuild their ravaged country. Reconstruction is not an easy task, and the costs of such reconstruction after a war of this magnitude will be horrendous. Who will bear the costs of reconstruction? So, there must also be a view as to how the war should end. But what sort of framework can bring an end to the destruction and criminality we are witnessing and also hold to account those who have committed these atrocities? How can such a framework protect the interests of Ukraine in the post-war period? These and many other questions need reflection and deliberation.
“Since 24 February 2022, the world is witnessing the unprovoked, brutal aggression of one country against its neighbour for no apparent, logically explainable reason, other than the imperialistic fantasy of celebrating the 350th anniversary of Tsar Peter I by duplicating the territorial conquests which led to Peter I take on the title of Emperor in 1721. It will be recalled that Tsar Peter I acquired his title as “the Great” because of the reforms he introduced and his modernization and Westernization of a backward and unstable Russia, as well as by cutting “a window to Europe” on the shores of the Baltic Sea. He did this by conquering territories until then under the rule of kings of Sweden and of Poland, including what are now Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Finland, and Ukraine, as well as the fortress of Azov on the sea of the same name. Those events, set in motion by a ruler born 350 years ago, are now publicly declared by President Putin as a point of reference for creating a new world order, in flagrant contravention of the Charter of the UN and international law. Peter I did not want just more power and more territory. He also wanted his country to become more advanced and more progressive, even if some of the changes he introduced, such as cutting the long beards of his boyars, were more superficial than deeply substantial. Sadly, the current president of Russia, who sees himself as an uncrowned Peter the Second in his own delusions of grandeur, is achieving the very contrary of his historical idol. He is isolating Russia and reducing it to a pariah state, shunned by all those who aspire to a rules-based international order. While the barbaric depredations of his army in Ukraine and the scorched earth policy of destroying everything in their path are a direct echo of what Peter the Great did to that country during his war with king Charles XII of Sweden, the repression of all freedom of thought and speech in his own country represent a frightening rebirth of the totalitarian terror of the Soviet Union, especially during its Stalinist times. The events now happening in Ukraine are not just devastating that country, but we are seeing waves of negative consequences that are spreading out and rippling across the whole world, including far-away continents. Madame Rosalia Serrano, former president of Ecuador, mentioned that the banana growers in her country, for instance, are also negatively affected by what is now happening on the European continent. The same destructive domino effect applies to many other problems currently facing the world. We have just heard an outline of the plans for approaching them from the president of our host country, which set the tone for a solutions-oriented approach in responding to the multiple crises that we are facing. We are always facing some kind of crisis but the current crisis concerning the world order lies at the centre of this year’s program for the Baku Forum. We are at a turning point in history and are faced with a choice: Whether to accept the present and work with the given of the present in order to move into a better future, or whether we look behind us and take on this retrograde direction by deciding to single out some period in history that seems to us more pleasing, or at least more pleasing to the vanity and imagined grandeur of some leaders. Such revisionism, which refuses to accept the existing situation and yearns for a return to injustices and wrongs of long ago rather than rectifying them in the present and future, represents an attitude that truly bodes ill for all concerned, whether directly or indirectly.

We are at a point where we need solutions, to paths that we might follow in a world situation where we see regress rather than progress, where we see gross injustice rule, rather than international law and international order. We see the threat of increased poverty, and indeed famine, in many parts of the world, just because of the grandiosity and claims to exceptionalism of Russia, its leader and its people. What amounts to a collective paranoia, a nation-wide mania of grandeur of one single country, is producing real threats to world stability. Meanwhile, in Ukraine itself, death and destruction continue, soldiers and civilians die or are mutilat-
mutilated, crimes against humanity are being committed.

The outlandish accusations that Russia has addressed to Ukraine as excuses for the invasion of 24 February 2022 are but the latest and most extreme expression of President Putin’s unwillingness to accept the verdict of history and the overdue and well merited collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Instead of seizing the opportunity to convert Russia itself to a free and democratic state, President Putin has devoted his energies to revanchist attacks on all the former parts of the Soviet Union that have recovered their independence and become prosperous and modern states. We have recently heard open threats against neighbouring countries expressed by deputies of the Russian Duma. Admittedly, as President Putin himself told me years ago in direct conversation: “whoever listens or pays attention to what the deputies of the Duma are saying!” Nevertheless, whatever these deputies may be saying must necessarily be in tune with views developed in the Kremlin. That is why it is alarming to hear a deputy of the Duma propose to declare null and void, for instance, the agreement whereby the Russian Federation accepts the declaration of the renewed independence of Lithuania after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Some journalists have already interpreted this as implying that the next country Russia is going to invade will be Lithuania, unlikely as it is to happen. Nonetheless, I am sure that Lithuanians, just like Estonians and Latvians, are very much comforted to know themselves to be under the collective security protection of NATO, because dire threats can never be taken lightly. The inimical and aggressive attitude of Russia towards territories that at some historical time or another have been under its occupation or annexation is a real threat to every country on its geographical periphery. God knows Russia is already huge in terms of the expanse of its territory, yet evidently it is still not big enough to satisfy its ambitions of greatness. In this, there has been an uninterrupted continuity between tsarist Russia, Soviet Russia, and contemporary Russia. In addition to outright incorporation of neighbouring lands, there has also been a continual concern about the spheres of influence extending beyond the borders of Russia proper. As President Putin has stated again and again over the years, Russia allegedly feels so threatened by potential aggression coming from other great powers, especially the Western ones, that it absolutely must be surrounded by a ring of compliant and subservient colonies, countries that would not dare take any important step without direction or approval from the Kremlin. Ukraine is now being attacked because it defiantly broke out of that mold, without having the protective cover of either NATO or European Union membership to fall back upon. Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia broke out of the mold and did manage to become NATO and EU members. All countries that are part of what Russia considers its lifebuoy ring of vassal states, however, have what I call cuckoo’s eggs laid by Russia well in advance of their hatching into agents of internal friction or better still areas of frozen conflict meant never to be peacefully solved. When Stalin came to power in the Soviet Union, the ruling slogan of the day was “socialist in content but national in form”. The Great Dictator soon realized how dangerous this was, what with Ukrainian writers starting to publish in the Ukrainian language and those of other republics doing the same within their national cultures. The totalitarian vertical of power that was Communism in the USSR needed a strong cadre of supporters to reinforce the direct power of the Communist leadership and its organs of repression. Stalin soon saw that “all nations being equal under socialism” may have sounded good, but that one nation – the Russian people – being declared as superior to all others sounded even better. In addition, extensive plans were drawn up and realized for keeping all parts of the USSR interdependent economically to such an extent that any thoughts of disentanglement would appear hopeless. Ethnic cleansing was achieved through brutal mass deportations to Siberia and beyond the Arctic Circle, russification was achieved by mass immigration of either ethnic Russians themselves or simply any other nationality form near or far who would weaken the role of any “native” languages in the public sphere. The long-term strategy of the Soviet Union was to occupy as many territories as possible surrounding the central core, which was Russia itself, and to make sure to implant in each peripheral region some time bomb or booby-trap that would explode at a conveniently chosen time in the future, or that could be encouraged to explode through creating animosity or conflicts both within and between neighbouring states. The implementation and continuation of this strategy by the Russian Federation is largely responsible for the ring of zones of frozen conflicts surrounding Russia that remains
When Stalin came to power in the Soviet Union, the ruling slogan of the day was “socialist in content but national in form”. The Great Dictator soon realized how dangerous this was, what with Ukrainian writers starting to publish in the Ukrainian language and those of other republics doing the same within their national cultures. The totalitarian vertical of power that was Communism in the USSR needed a strong cadre of supporters to reinforce the direct power of the Communist leadership and its organs of repression. Stalin soon saw that “all nations being equal under socialism” may have sounded good, but that one nation – the Russian people – being declared as superior to all others sounded even better. In addition, extensive plans were drawn up and realized for keeping all parts of the USSR interdependent economically to such an extent that any thoughts of disentanglement would appear hopeless. Ethnic cleansing was achieved through brutal mass deportations to Siberia and beyond the Arctic Circle, russification was achieved by mass immigration of either ethnic Russians themselves or simply any other nationality form near or far who would weaken the role of any “native” languages in the public sphere. The long-term strategy of the Soviet Union was to occupy as many territories as possible surrounding the central core, which was Russia itself, and to make sure to implant in each peripheral region some time bomb or booby-trap that would explode at a conveniently chosen time in the future, or that could be encouraged to explode through creating animosity or conflicts both within and between neighbouring states. The implementation and continuation of this strategy by the Russian Federation is largely responsible for the ring of zones of frozen conflicts surrounding Russia that remains in place up to this day. One example of this is the previously agricultural republic of Moldova, which theoretically inherited the heavily industrialized and russified region of Transdniestria after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. For all practical purposes, this region was quickly turned into an enclave governed by Russia. Since 2008, the invasion of Georgia by Russian troops has left that country shorn of nearly a fifth of its territory, the secessionist regions again coming under the control of Russia. Crimea was invaded and annexed in 2014, Donetsk and Luhansk as good as taken over by camouflaged Russian troops and recognized as independent republics soon to be begging for annexation in February 2022. And it is only since the open conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan in 2020 that our host country has been able to recover most of its legitimate territory, which had been occupied by Russian-supported Armenia for the preceding decades.

It should be emphasized that frozen conflicts need not remain frozen forever and must be resolved at some point in one way or another. In the case of the relations between Azerbaijan and Armenia, the international community has looked with renewed hope upon the recent negotiations under the aegis of Mr. Charles Michel as a mediator representing the European Union. A lowering of the tensions between neighbouring countries is always desirable and one can only hope for a continuation of the very positive steps recently achieved toward a normalization of the territorial and political situation.

Mediation as a means of solving conflicts, however, cannot be done over the heads of those who are most directly concerned. A solution to the military conflict between Russia and Ukraine must not be achieved by leaders from other parts of the world “cutting a deal” with the president of Russia without the Ukrainian people being a party to the discussions and without the will of the Ukrainian people being respected. Only the people of Ukraine have the right to decide what kind of future that they want for themselves, whom they elect as their political leaders and what kind of partnerships they wish to form or alliances that they wish to engage in. In addition, mediation can never succeed without goodwill on both sides of a conflict and goodwill remains the sine qua non of any successful conflict resolution.

Goodwill is the basis of civil cohabitation between regions, between countries, as well as between individuals. I remember two letters I received shortly after being elected President of Latvia from a sister and a brother who had inherited a house from their parents after the restitution of private property in our country. They simply could not agree on how to divide their inheritance. Each said they could not live together under the same roof. Exasperated, the brother threatened to saw the wooden house in half and the sister wailed about the house about to be destroyed! When you have, within the same family, the inability to live together and reach any agreement, you can imagine how inevitable it is that the
-ment, you can imagine how inevitable it is that the world will continue to have conflicts. It will continue to have crises and it will continue to have challenges. The questions concerning each nation’s security, the questions about a new post-pandemic world order, of the ability of humankind to stop the dangerous acceleration of climate change and counter the threats of widespread hunger, the questions about good governance and social justice for all, these all are subjects that are on the agenda of the Ninth Baku Forum, as they have been on the agenda of humanity as well".
The Moderator, Ambassador Susan Elliott from the United States, opened the session and invited former Ukraine President Viktor Yushchenko to address the Global Baku Forum. “The only way to resolve the war is by speaking to the world. This war is not only a Ukrainian issue, or a Moldovan, Georgian or Karabakh issue but a question about the policy of Russia and how in the 21st century after the end of WWII we could end up where we are today. We witness a textbook example of an aggressor understood by 50 Allies occupying Ukraine and currently conducting seven different wars in the world. How is it possible after 20 years to have ‘Putinism’ in Europe? This is a deeply and most corrupt situation today where Putin created a ‘corrupt international’. We see a pattern where European politicians, once their terms in office completed, board a plane or a train to Moscow, stand in a line to Gazprom or Rosneft or other institutions in Russia asking for a high paid job as shown by former Prime Ministers, Chancellors, and Ministers aka ‘Schröderisation’. The Russian Opposition is in prison, all independent media closed, thousands of Russians with a conscience and understanding have been forced to leave and are scattered around the world: this is real ‘Putinism’ in action. Addressing security issues, the President remembered the Spring 2008 Bucharest summit where both Ukraine and Georgia were blocked from the NATO candidature status by the leaders of France and Germany because Chancellor Merkel stressed high corruption in those countries at a time when Schröder was already working for Gazprom! It was therefore no surprise that a few months later Putin sent his troops into Georgia where he met a brave and courageous people of 3.5 million despite its size was considered a great threat to Russia and thus “forcing Georgia into peace”? It is therefore no surprise that Putin decides to invade Crimea and Donbass five years later again claiming he is a ‘liberator’ while Germany and France giving high calibre weapons, night goggles and other equipment to Russia currently being used in Ukraine’s Eastern and Southern territories. If we don’t understand the sources of today’s evil of Putin and Putin’s Russia presented to the world urging us to work in a united manner, when Russia occupied 7% of Ukraine in 2014, he controlled 15% of the territory a month ago, and 20% today. Now we are hearing “wise” voices from the West on whether Ukraine would be willing to make territorial concessions or gifts to Putin as a face-saving device. Over the last hundred days, the Russian government has received € 93 billion in payments for their energy resources since the start of the war, while Ukraine receives in material and financial assistance around € 8 billion! I know Ukraine will be victorious but to conclude the Ukraine Question concerns us all which must remain the Number One question to us all: peace will only come when we win. Also important are the dangers posed by Russia to other countries. After the war ends, we will all gather in Bucha or other destroyed locations like Mariopol to conduct court proceedings on crimes committed against Ukraine followed by international economic and security conferences creating a new concept of international security for a new global order. But today’s first assignment is victory, Glory to Ukraine”. The February 24th aggression by Russia changed the world challenging the global order by violating every single rule upon which the world is based.
This challenge concerns all countries and there will be no peace, no stability, no security unless Russia and Putin are stopped, a premeditated war waged against all which is understood by all. The future of the world is being decided in Ukraine. We have a Russian Empire and emperor which want to conquer territory. There is no in-between position: sides need to be taken now. Russia has weaponised everything and blackmailed the world from refugees to food security and energy security accompanied by aggressive propaganda intoxicating peoples’ minds. The bad news is that Putin does not want to stop even after defeat, but the good news is that he can be stopped if unity prevails, and he has no safe haven: his power is not in his military. The time has come to no longer be scared and for ‘de-putinisation’ of Russia and the world through deliverance of more weapons to Ukraine, more sanctions and trade embargoes against Russia and a Marshall-like Plan for Ukraine with EU and NATO membership perspective. Ukraine is paying the highest price for EU candidate status which it should receive shortly, and hopefully a MAP for NATO. Courage and help are required today to save Ukraine and the world. Katerina Yushchenko warned over the years that a reckoning was coming on Russia’s aggressive intentions but to no avail especially in Europe. and a return to “business as usual” with the aggressor with the end of sanctions. Russia intends to erase Ukraine via ethnic cleansing: “I hate them, as long as I am alive I will do everything to make them disappear” are the words of former President Medvedev! Ukraine’s goal is to survive and be part of the West as an institutional civilisational choice which endangers Putin’s kleptocratic regime. Russia for 450 years has tried to create an Empire that has expanded at a rate of 50 square miles per day or 130 square kilometres. Ukraine is an instrument for Russia’s further geopolitical ambitions. Ukraine has learned not to trust Russia. It will win the war but must also win the peace and ensure its security and prosperity. With Russia, only a ceasefire is possible but how to deal with this country after the end of the war? Until there is a change, Russia should be expelled from political, economic and security organisations including the UNSC, OSCE, WTO and others like G20. Russia must be brought to court and face tribunals for war crimes including the crime of aggression: Russia must be “de-putinised” as Germany was de-nazified to the benefit of the world and to the Russian peoples.

President Kolinda Grabar-Kitarovic from Croatia recalled that her country had witnessed aggression and had to rebuild after the war the challenging process of reconciliation. Priorities are to end the war, prevent any escalation, maintain global cohesion and protect common values, redefine
relations with Russia and post-conflict rebuilding and reconciliation process. Tom Vandenkendelaere from Belgium gave a European Parliament viewpoint on the war in Ukraine with a specific focus on the fight against impunity, hybrid warfare and economic sanctions. Prosecuting the perpetrators of IHL is an obligation and support of the ICC prosecutor is a must by installing an international tribunal. The EU Hybrid Warfare Rapid Reaction Force is a first step in addressing Russian disinformation and other hybrid malign activities. On sanctions a phased approach is better lest they lead to disunity among Europeans. Eka Tkeshelashvili from Georgia highlighted the definitive largescale invasion of Ukraine by Russia with an audacious genocidal intent. Ukraine must win the war in order to avoid protracted conflict.
The marriage of the smart phone and the internet created a generation of connected, individuals texting to each other all the time. From mass media (such as Movies, TV, radio) where content is produced by a few and consumed by the masses, to a world where every individual is both a content producer and a consumer. Social media are computer-mediated technologies that facilitate the creation and sharing of information, ideas, and personal views. Social media are the interactive Web 2.0 Internet-based applications and are dominated by platforms that are owned by giant corporations. They are used for advertising and propaganda. This has led to interference in the political processes of the country or other countries. They have provided a megaphone effect and a huge multiplier for lies and inaccuracies. Posts are un-vetted, and can go viral in minutes, whereas the traditional media need to check and recheck their news or their stories before broadcasting them. From anti-vaccine disinformation and misinformation that has doubtless led to a lot of loss of life, to constant political conspiracy theories, the social media have become a very important part of the communication landscape. Everything is now being run by computer systems. That adds another risk factor because such systems are vulnerable to technical attacks launched by a few specialists from anywhere in the world.
Paul Révay from France and moderator invited David Chikvaidze from the UN Office in Geneva to open the discussion on the broad issues allotted to this panel. The UN is born of war and has lived with war. Ukraine is a wakeup call for the UN and the world inasmuch for the General Assembly which should be running the world, and not the Security Council. Which UN does one talk about? Is it the UN “system” with its specialised agencies, or the GA with 193 member countries or the 15 member-states sitting on the Security Council or the 5 Permanent Members wielding the veto power? Basically, the humanitarian parts, human rights and the programmes, funds, specialised agencies are doing a great job; criticism arises solely on the political side of the UN focused on the Security Council and the P5. The magic trick would be to abolish the veto power. On the criticism of the UN in not being proactive, the question must be “which UN?”. The UN Secretariat cannot fulfil such a role as long as a mandate is not given to it by the member states, and funding – often lacking -- is also required for any given mandate. UN must also provide for a better and solid communication on its activities where it fulfils properly its duties. Returning to Ukraine, “this is no time (for Europe) to go wobbly” on sanctions which also hurt at home. What happens after the war ends also requires deep thinking. The UN Common Agenda needs to be fully implemented by the member states through the imperative of a return to true and effective multilateralism. Turning to the European neighbourhood, Senator Michal Kaminski from Poland stressed the importance of remaining firm vis-à-vis Russian aggression, both as a Polish and European citizen. As for the UN, Europe also needs to change after the wakeup call of Ukraine and must also strive for greater integration. This path will depend on the Central and East Europeans being heard by their Western partners. From a Polish perspective, relations with Russia and energy security remain part of the national consensus. Of greater importance will be to change the Russian mindset and see how the Russian people will react to losing the war they are currently waging in Ukraine as well as the need to build a new security order. The Senator shared his horror after having visited Bucha and Irpin in Ukraine where rape is now an official policy of the Russian army. Europe must come up with a policy of strongly defending its values lest it risks falling into appeasement.
As the Cold War ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union in the beginning of the 1990s, many believed that a new era of democratic governance and capitalist economics had started. Many hoped that the global architecture for peace and security designed at the end of World War II would come into its own with the lifting of the constraints imposed by the Cold War on its proper functioning. The promise of the UN system and the commitment of the world to the concept of advancing Human Rights and dealing with environmental problems seemed to be within reach. However, problems still abounded. From the collapse of Yugoslavia into warring states, to the genocide in Rwanda, to wars in the Middle East, harbingers of instability were still plentiful. At the start of the 21st century, the horrible events of 9/11 and its aftermath led to a new period where tectonic shifts started occurring. We witnessed a shift towards Asia from the Atlantic focus of the past century. And beyond the launch of a full-scale war in Ukraine, there are tensions in many parts of the world. So, while the first panel dealt with what we could and should do to confront the war in Ukraine, we also need to rethink the broader questions of what should be done to reconfigure the global architecture for peace and security in the world.
Prime Minister Yves Leterme from Belgium moderated the panel on how to face the challenges of global security and the confrontation between a rule-based multilateral order and the brutality pursued by Putin and invited Alexander Likhotal, formerly from Russia, to address the participants. He shared the deep pain of Ukraine upon Russia’s aggression, a country which will however not “evaporate”. Russia’s war of aggression in Ukraine has upended the world order created after WWII and is a direct, blatant violation of the UN Charter. However shameful the characterisation of the war as an “international dispute”, the UN’s utility remains. The Russian regime must be “defeated”, and Ukraine be “victorious” but how to define both terms? Wang Chao from China noted that the world is going through an unprecedented time of division and confrontation which the international community must address such as recently proposed by President Xi Jinping on a “Global Security Initiative” with common, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security at its core respecting the sovereignty and integrity of all countries and upholding the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. True multilateralism must be upheld with the irreplaceable UN system at its core. Forming new blocks fuelled by Cold War mentality is to be equated to pseudo multilateralism. A political solution on the Ukraine issue must be sought as proposed by China promoting dialogue and peace talks and disapproving the use of war or sanctions. Prince Turki Al Faisal Al Saud weeps for Ukraine but also for other nations who have suffered aggression, in the Middle East, Africa or Asia, from the invasion of Iraq in 2003 or the occupation in Palestine to Kashmir or Myanmar. The reform of UN system is much needed but those who devised it have the Security Council with veto powers to prevent it. Alas, General Assembly resolutions are not implemented. A reform proposal would be for GA resolutions once passed not be vetoed thereafter. The fundamental rule of non-intervention in domestic affairs of sovereign states must be upheld lest chaos become the hallmark in international affairs. Tzipi Livni from Israel focussed on global issues and the importance of multilateralism challenged even before the Russian invasion of Ukraine and questioned by the leader of the Free World under the “America First” slogan of the Trump Presidency. Another challenge is globalisation which creates gaps within societies and between nations. Russia’s war shocked the world because it stemmed from a country which was part of this post-WWII P5 UNSC understanding. The question remains on how to confront global threats and address the realities on the ground beyond declamatory speeches including within a non-functioning UN. The young generation with its social networks’ tools can here be very useful and influence leaders. Giorgi Margvelashvili from Georgia asked how and on what principles the new security order will be rebuilt after the war in Europe. History can be helpful in understanding. President Bush visiting Soviet Kiev in August 1991 talked about “suicidal nationalism based upon ethnic hatred” which showed an utter lack of understanding of major historic currents on the move. Building a CIS after the fall of the USSR did not work either. Another benchmark was the 2007 Munich Security Conference speech of President Putin where a new vision of “near neighbourhood”
was spelled out signalling a return to “spheres of influence” on the continent. Yet another misunderstood lesson: the 1994 Budapest Memorandum signed in a spirit of building a new world. Then 2008 with an aggression against Georgia followed in 2014 with aggression against Ukraine's Donbass and the pure annexation of Crimea. Today we are still unsettled on the meaning of security in Europe, both on what vision is shared by our allies and on the vision of an imperialistic Russia with a nuclear option. Were Russia to succeed, this will be a real blow to European and a world rules-based order.
Hikmat Hajiyev from Azerbaijan noted one of the biggest achievements of the international community after end of the two world wars were codification of the international system based on the principles of international law, and institutionalisation of international relations. In 1991, upon disintegration of the USSR, Azerbaijan gained its independence entering the system of international relations which it naively thought would provide peace, security and prosperity. 30 years ago, Azerbaijan faced alone its own crisis with Armenia’s aggression and occupation while the international community remained silent. UNSC adopted four resolutions reaffirming Azerbaijan’s territorial integrity and sovereignty having to wait for 30 years before its implementation: Europe has finally understood this sacrosanct principle. Turkey, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia understood it well in advance and supported Azerbaijan. Multilateralism should be protected especially for small and mid-sized countries providing the possibility to be sovereign and equal members of the international community and to speak out within the UN system which remains a success story except for the peace and security chapters under the responsibility of the Security Council. The post-WWII P5 status quo cannot be sustained any longer as it is no longer representative: it requires immediate reform! The recent GA Resolution is a step forward whereby the vetoing country has then to explain its decision to the General Assembly. Regarding the Non-alignment Movement, it continues to provide a third way between East-West confrontation and weak North-South cooperation. The world needs to adapt more rapidly to new realities by recommitting itself to the shared principles enshrined in the UN Charter. The Moderator wondered whether social ownership should be taken into account when addressing the reform and improvement of the UN system to be more concrete? 21st century warfare has extended to the information sphere. Improving social ownership with better connection to citizens is possibly a way to improve the functioning and implementation of UN resolutions. Alexander Likhotal responded by noting that the world had outlived the system of global management that existed before. We are still living in a Westphalian system with several ideas since such as The Hague Criminal Court or the R2P principle in 2005. But Responsibility to Protect was completely inversed by various dictatorial regimes including Russia today: 25 million Russians living outside Russia now gives the pretext to intervene in domestic affairs of the near abroad! The idea that inter-national relations should be based on relations between states and governments is obsolete and dangerous as witnessed today: inter-social relations should be now envisaged with the growing role of global corporations and social communities. Tzipi Livni concurred inviting the international system to be more connected to the younger generations via social networking tools as utilised by President Zelensky. Current alliances, also, should not be only strengthened but also broadened. For Wang Chao, regional blocs are being created by U.S. Cold War
mentality targeting China whereby putting many countries into painful situations on which side to choose. The Ukraine crisis is an example of the indivisibility of security and can be traced back to the expansion of NATO: military organisations should not be expanded both in membership and scope. Petre Roman noted that Putin now refers to former Russian territories under Peter the Great and no longer to international legality: what is the meaning of peaceful resolutions of conflicts under such conditions? The world is now moving towards a rules-based disorder. An Afghan respondent remarked that NATO left Afghanistan without any justification after 22 years: how can Ukrainians now trust NATO? Hakima El Haite from Morocco wondered what could be done immediately to resolve the challenges faced by the UN system. For Hikmat Hajiyev, the world did not learn the lessons of 9/11 with a new clash of civilisation unfolding, or the warning call of Covid 19 or February 24th: additional challenges need to be faced such as energy security, migration flows or the global food crisis having long-term repercussions on global health issues. Our prevention policies have failed and need to be redressed when building a new global order.
Publics, businesses, and governments face rising demand, dangerous global security realities, and the need to revise the world’s energy infrastructure dramatically due to climate change. Moreover, uncertain energy supplies and rising oil and natural gas prices are translating into global inflation with follow-on political effects in many countries at a time when they continue to face an additional set of economic challenges coming on top of the disruption of global supply chains and the persisting impacts of the COVID19 pandemic. Sectors aside from those immediately associated with energy use, such as manufacturing and transportation, are seriously affected: the rising prices of fuel hurt farmers’ ability to plant, till, harvest, and market crops while higher natural gas prices have caused fertilizer prices to spike. The playbook followed in the past, e.g., Saudi Arabia and other energy producers with significant excess production capabilities upping their output to stabilize markets, is not necessarily working now. In addition, the Russian invasion of Ukraine, coming on top of past policies that weaponized oil and especially natural gas sales, has pushed European countries to pursue urgent programs to decrease purchases of Russian hydrocarbon exports. Investments in and development of green energy systems, while dramatic, are not sufficient or coming online fast enough to address global energy needs in the immediate or even medium-term; in fact, we may be moving to increased coal consumption, and thus higher CO2 emissions, due high natural gas prices. The overarching question is whether we can adopt a two-track approach that deals with the world’s immediate and short-term needs for energy, but which also keeps a focus on making the transformations to a more sustainable economy we need to make. But getting governments -- or other organizations for that matter -- to do these two things at once may be much easier said than done.
The moderator Ambassador Robert Cekuta from the United States opened by the need to redefine “energy security” so that it is not just the adequate assured predictable energy at affordable price but also access to sustainable energy at an affordable price given the role of energy in bringing about higher CO2 levels in climate change. Geopolitical, geostrategic, and commercial factors also play an important role.

Vinton Cerf from the United States opened the panel discussion by focussing his remarks on cyber and by highlighting the alluring aspect of nationalism where zero-sum thinking is at its core. Knowledge alone is not power, but power sharing and networking are true power today with its multiplier effect as shown by Covid vaccine testing and distribution. Closing digital borders and a fragmented Internet as well as sequencing information are not in the interest of the international community. Protecting relevant information remains however valid. At times of catastrophic threats to the global ecosystem, open information needs to be pursued to respond effectively to the challenges ahead. Rosen Plevneliev from Bulgaria noted no better example than his country when addressing energy security. Bulgaria knew it would pay a heavy price in the war on Ukraine but was surprised that Russia would cut gas supplies without explanations in 24 hours! The current war is also about energy and Bulgaria will cut down its fossil fuel imports by 90% by end of year representing a fall in revenue of $25 billion for Russia. By the end of 2022, Russia will lose overall $200 billion in energy revenues, halving its revenues in a few months. But other countries such as India are now importing Russian oil representing 18% of its needs and at a reduced price of $35/barrel. The “Power of Siberia” pipeline to China is also under construction. By 2024, EU will be totally independent of Russian oil and gas. To conclude, Europe must stay united during this difficult period and remain ambitious to become carbon-free by 2050. Jean Baderschneider from the United States stressed that access to cheap energy is essential for a functioning economy. Conflict, climate change and Covid have affected the energy sector. The quicker countries reach green energy, the quicker the climate change issue will be solved but a need on fossil fuels will continue to be required in the short term to reach this goal both on the production and infrastructure sides such as in LNG terminals investments. Vaclav Klaus from Czechia noted that today’s threats to energy security should not be a surprise which started well before the war. Frustration abounds that after 30 years of the fall of communism, the western world continues to live in a centrally administered economy manipulating prices and production which explains energy insecurity these days characterised by the global warming panic and the flawed EU Green Deal project. Joseph Muscat from Malta witnesses weaponization of currencies, with the US Dollar as the spear, an attempt of a new gold standard with the Rouble, a weaponization of the energy markets and of food supplies. Democratisation of energy supplies is moving ahead. What is being done today on energy security is not perfect such as on needed sanctions with European consumers having to pay more, Russia getting lesser revenue and subsidising India and China in their energy requirements not to omit...
EU governments in their lower tax revenues. The long-term effects of such policies need to be considered, including rehabilitations by the West of regimes such as Iran or Venezuela closer to Russian “values”.
Elnur Soltanov from Azerbaijan highlighted the country’s goal to provide solutions to the energy crisis for its partners by increasing its national gas production and exports by 7% compared to 2021 and to continue over the next. The Southern Gas Corridor to EU will double its volume. Azerbaijan also exports clean electricity which increased by 45% since 2020. The current biggest deal is to produce green electricity especially from the Caspian Sea to include a new Green Corridor to Europe via the Zangezur corridor.

Ana Birchall from Romania stressed that the current war on Ukraine has demonstrated the importance of a balanced energy mix in the EU and of a resilient energy system when faced with extreme events. The over-reliance on Russian energy imports was a vulnerability of the EU even before the war started with the Central and Eastern European countries alerting their Western partners on dangers which were not heeded. Three concerns are notable: security of supply, carbonisation and maintaining an affordable energy price for consumers. A balanced mix of energy needs to be taken by each country in consideration of realities on the ground as well as the importance of energy independence. The Trans Balkan Corridor (Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania) and the Vertical Corridor (Greece-Bulgaria interconnector) will facilitate security of supply of vital necessity to the Black Sea Region.

Hakima El Haite from Morocco recalled the unanimous decision by all 195 nations to adopt in 2015 the SDGs and the 2016 Paris Agreement after 21 years of negotiations with no concrete results including on carbon pricing. But technological innovation is changing the picture as witness the coming about of hydrogen or solar power. Finally, energy transition needs to be sped up. The world is now interconnected so any solutions proposed by Europe
The moderator wondered if an international consortium should be set up to help drive an electricity grid interconnection. The Azerbaijan Minister concurred that developing the immense Caspian Sea resources will require consortium-type arrangements including tremendous financial requirements for building transmission lines. Green hydrogen is a promising way forward. Ismael Serageldin recalled that electricity is only about 15% of total Co2 emissions. Cement and steel plants need huge investments which can’t be written off; agriculture represents 15% of global emissions; melting of the permafrost is going to liberate methane which explains the centrality of the discussion on energy decarbonisation. Interaction with the oceans -- and hydrological cycles -- is now a new discovery including deep ocean currents affecting climate change. To conclude, the panellists agreed that the world needs to be governed by policies, not by media frenzies. Europe has also rediscovered the importance of the Mediterranean and its links to Africa. Jean Baderschneider reminded all that 75% of GHG comes from burning fossil fuels so urgent action must be undertaken via renewables in a sensible way.
Zlatko Lagumdžija, as Moderator from Bosnia, recalled at the outset recent meetings held between NGIC and WHO Director General on launching a cooperation between both organisations and the signing of a MoU, and invited Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus to address the conference: The Covid pandemic is still far from over with 1 billion still unvaccinated in low-income countries. The history of recent pandemics is panic and neglect: lessons go unlearned. WHO proposes a stronger global architecture for health emergency preparedness and response with a new legally binding international instrument to support closer cooperation and coordination between countries in the face of global threats. An intergovernmental body has been established and begun its work on developing this new Treaty. Stronger governance is needed that is coherent, inclusive, and accountable. A high political leadership council is required for rapid and coordinated action. Stronger systems and tools are needed to prevent, detect, and respond rapidly to health emergencies such as the WHO Hub for Pandemic and Epidemic Intelligence to enhance global information and the sharing of novel biological materials. Adequate and efficient financing is also required, domestically and internationally with an estimated $31 billion/year needed (WHO/WB) for global health security. The World Health Assembly passed a landmark historic resolution to increase assessed contributions to a target of 50% of WHO budget by the end of the decade. A strong primary healthcare system is also vital for promoting health and preventing disease. With the Covid pandemic, the world should have realised by now the centrality of health.

Maria Fernanda Espinosa from Ecuador noted humanity continues to make the same mistakes even after 300 recommendations on Covid-19! A whole of society response is needed. Universal healthcare is the key for resilience building and response capacity. The importance of civil society, public-private cooperation and of the subsidiarity principle are vital as well as vaccine development and deployment capacity with the extraordinary role taken by women and girls in health workforces but absent from policy decision. Regional cooperative ventures are essential with multilateralism as the most important tool. Uneven Covid recovery programmes between the Global North and Global South need to be overcome urgently: generosity and solidarity should be at the centre of all SDG policies.
Valdis Zatlers from Latvia singled out a problem for WHO which recruits its employees with relevant expertise, but the organisation is based on member states represented by politicians who decide on policy under stress, and on their implementation such as vaccine distribution: both experts and politicians must work in tandem while keeping in mind the people to whom vaccines are destined. The anti-vax movement requires explanation and the “Zero Covid” policy is a mistake. To conclude, human rights go hand in hand with universal healthcare. Former UNSG Ban Ki-moon sent a message to the NGIC participants by which he expressed his worries that the world was becoming even more fractured, when pandemics and conflicts are growing alongside elevated risks to the planet and its biodiversity. Continued cooperation, innovation and collaboration are critical to overcome global health threats with a strengthened WHO at the centre. Multilateral coordination on global health is urgently needed as well as rapid assured vaccine treatments and diagnostics that must be insured in all countries. A new multilateralism is called for in which global rules are better calibrated towards the overarching goals of social and economic stability, peace and shared prosperity where Covid-19 set the terms of public, private and third sector interaction.

Jeffrey Sachs from the United States noted that humanity had not fought well the Covid-19 pandemic with 7-17 million deaths and heavy political failures of global cooperation and financing and within countries such as in the U.S. where facemasks became highly politically charged. Two points were highlighted. On the origins of the virus, it could have come out of US biotechnology and a laboratory creation. Complete US duplicity in honest accounting on current bio research and the intention to experiment in a way that could have created this virus is alarming. Both the U.S. and China need to be transparent raising the question of surveillance. On the public health finance question, the real gap is in tens of billions of dollars (not 31 with a 10 billion gap as mentioned by World Bank) in health support systems in poor countries.

Teymur Musayev from Azerbaijan recalled the WHO declaration of the state of health emergency three years ago due to the Covid-19 outbreak. The time has come to review the management of this pandemic and its lessons. The spread of disease infection is a global matter, but some countries only took care of their citizens. Intellectual property rights should be waived when the health is a matter of global concern. Proper financial support and awards should be bestowed to scientists. Citizens public trust in government is a key component for pandemic response and management. In
Azerbaijan, a task force was established under the cabinet of ministers in strong collaboration with WHO. Mental health deteriorations due to lockdowns and depressions were rapidly recognised. A new benchmark for healthcare professionals—based on absolute integration and unification of biomedical sciences and information technologies was set up and the healthcare landscape was dramatically changed due to big data flows which must be shared. WHO named vaccine hesitancy—“infodemic” and disinformation—as one of the major global threats. Global coordination of an early-warning system, transmission tracking and sharing vaccines, tests and medical devices must top the agenda as well as address the social economy determinants of the health care systems with WHO at the center. Mladen Ivanic from Bosnia and Herzegovina recalled the chaos at the outset of the pandemic from ventilators to isolation confronting a borderless virus with politicians faced by reality at home versus much needed global cooperation. Strong value-based multilateral institutions are needed if only to improve healthcare systems in poor countries. Trust in government institutions by citizens must be regained in the world as well as the importance of science lest the social contract be eroded was a parting word by Maria Fernanda Espinosa.
WHO Director General concluded the session by focussing on a few issues raised by the discussion. To start, knowing the origins of the virus will prevent the next outbreak which is also a moral obligation owed to those who died and suffered. Deaths estimated by WHO is 15 million, not the reported 6 million. Countries must be transparent on the origins, timing and location of the Covid virus. WHO keeps all options on the table, including the lab leak. China is not sharing raw data which sent out the first report, but cooperation with the United States or other countries will also be needed. On financing, $10 billion is insufficient and is narrowly focused on pandemic preparedness and response. Investment in strengthening in particular primary and public health systems is highly important. Enlightened national self-interest can add value to the global interest. With strong national unity comes global solidarity when fighting pandemics, parting word by Maria Fernanda Espinosa.
Publics, businesses, and governments face rising demand, dangerous global security realities, and the need to revise the world’s energy infrastructure dramatically due to climate change. Moreover, uncertain energy supplies and rising oil and natural gas prices are translating into global inflation with follow-on political effects in many countries at a time when they continue to face an additional set of economic challenges coming on top of the disruption of global supply chains and the persisting impacts of the COVID19 pandemic. Sectors aside from those immediately associated with energy use, such as manufacturing and transportation, are seriously affected; the rising prices of fuel hurt farmers’ ability to plant, till, harvest, and market crops while higher natural gas prices have caused fertilizer prices to spike. The playbook followed in the past, e.g., Saudi Arabia and other energy producers with significant excess production capabilities upping their output to stabilize markets, is not necessarily working now. In addition, the Russian invasion of Ukraine, coming on top of past policies that weaponized oil and especially natural gas sales, has pushed European countries to pursue urgent programs to decrease purchases of Russian hydrocarbon exports. Investments in and development of green energy systems, while dramatic, are not sufficient or coming online fast enough to address global energy needs in the immediate or even medium-term; in fact, we may be moving to increased coal consumption, and thus higher CO2 emissions, due high natural gas prices. The overarching question is whether we can adopt a two-track approach that deals with the world’s immediate and short-term needs for energy, but which also keeps a focus on making the transformations to a more sustainable economy we need to make. But getting governments -- or other organizations for that matter -- to do these two things at once may be much easier said than done.
The Moderator Valdis Zatlers from Latvia gave the floor for opening remarks to Elnur Mammadov from Azerbaijan. The Deputy Foreign Minister informed on developments since the last Baku Forum held six months ago. In terms of stability and prosperity in the region, direct contacts between the Foreign Ministers of Azerbaijan and Armenia have been established, a first since over 30 years. The composition of the Border Delimitation Commission was agreed upon brokered by the European Council president. Elaborating a comprehensive peace treaty still awaits an Armenian response which would be a starting point to bring peace and prosperity to the region. The vision would be for Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia to cooperate directly, but Armenian territorial claims have firstly to be lifted.

Eka Tkeshelashvili from Georgia hoped for greater attention given by foreign actors to the South Caucasus particularly in the light of the Russian aggression in Ukraine. Azerbaijan and Georgia are leading the way in setting up closer bonds of cooperation to the benefit of the region as a whole. Georgia is willing to host trilateral talks with opportunities being raised for the first time since the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The region should also be wary of the challenges it must face including Russia with its vision of “divide and conquer”. 20% of Georgian territory remains under Russian occupation – an open wound also for the region at large -- hence the importance of building people-to-people relationships needed for peaceful coexistence in the future. Hikmet Cetin from Turkey recalled the recognition of all former Soviet Republics in December 1991 and the initial positive approach of the first Armenian president to establish peaceful relations which were thwarted by the radical Armenian opposition and diaspora communities leading to the first Karabakh war with the occupation of seven rayons beyond in Azerbaijan which led to Turkey’s closure of the border with Armenia, and to a frozen conflict in the region. The Minsk Group failed to find a solution leading Azerbaijan to free by armed force its territory. Now a realistic chance exists to achieving enduring peace and stability. Turkey and Armenia appointed special representatives to advance the normalisation process supported by Azerbaijan. A Russian perspective was rendered by Gennady Burbulis who stressed his difficulty of associating himself to the official standpoint of the Russian leadership. Profound preconditions have however been established with new prospects of peace as called for by

Hikmet Cetin from Turkey recalled the recognition of all former Soviet Republics in December 1991 and the initial positive approach of the first Armenian president to establish peaceful relations which
President Aliyev. In September 1991 he accompanied President Yeltsin to Nagorno-Karabakh: we were very naïve and sincere when thinking a foundation for mutual understanding and dialogue was possible. Tragedies and testing periods have been ongoing in the last 31 years. The official Russia will surely support the new strategy even more so with the coming visit of Foreign Minister Lavrov to Azerbaijan. Gennady Burbulis wondered who can promise to be an honest broker in this promising region where all efforts could culminate in a thriving result if only foundational values in the integrity of politics were present. Reconciliation requires from all sides to perceive and understand that the call to dialogue and trust, to peace-making and peace-loving, requires comprehensive preparation beyond declarations and intentions: integrity is required which cannot be reflected by any document. Faced by the threats and challenges in Europe and the world remind him of an outstanding document in human history: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which sets the foundation for dialogue and mutual trust.
As a proposed initiative, the Global Baku Forum should plan a series of roundtables in Tbilisi, Yerevan and Baku whereby efforts should be joined with modern day scientists and humanitarian activists having a great understanding of the subtle texture of this dialogue: it’s not sufficient to declare it but to learn from each other and to follow in the steps laid out by President Aliyev by assisting him in this endeavour. A European perspective was given by Rosen Plevneliev from Bulgaria who noted that to be globally strong, one needs to be regionally strong. A global regionalised world is in the making because of security of supplies chains and of unpredictability on the rise. This regionalisation will benefit the South Caucasus. Russia instilled instability in the region by fabricating various frozen conflicts, a convenient low-cost tool to keep neighbouring countries dependent. Integration is the only way forward in order to create sustainable peace. The role of the EU is here important with its various projects in close cooperation with Azerbaijan as a regional energy hub.

Lazar Comanescu from Romania highlighted the role of the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) and the geostrategic importance of the South Caucasus in the wider Black Sea area which offer reasons for optimism. In its 30th year, BSEC can contribute to finding solutions to the war in Ukraine through confidence building measures via economic development projects such as constructing a trade facility strategy. The Caucasus can become an energy transport hub between East Asia and Europe under the umbrella of BSEC. Developing people-to-people contacts will also be vital. The moderator opened the discussion and asked the Deputy Foreign Minister on how the various trilateral formats could be complementary. Elnur Mammadov agreed that these formats are complementary and not mutually exclusive. The EU solidified agreements between the protagonists and provided for concrete steps. As to the central location of Azerbaijan as a transport hub between East and West as well as North and South, the country has supported since 2013 the “One Belt One Road” (BRI) initiative by China. Massive reconstruction work is also underway in Karabakh declared as a Green Zone. Iran is not omitted in the regional initiatives being launched by Azerbaijan in the 3+3 format (the three Caucasus states and Turkey/Russia/Iran).
as well as the Azerbaijan-Iran MoU signed in March 2022 providing an alternative route to Nakhichevan via Iran.

As the Nizami Ganjavi International Center, we have the sad duty to announce the sudden passing of its faithful member Gennady Burbulis who unexpectedly passed away during the IXth Global Baku Forum on June 19, 2022. He will be fondly remembered as we extend our heartfelt condolences to his family Genadii Burbulis joined the activities of the NGIC in 2018 and was a regular and committed participant. He spoke with a strongly enlightened voice in favor of a renewed, integrated Russia after the fall of Communism, where he played such an eminent role as a co-signatory of the 1991 Belavezha Pact. Genadii Burbulis was born on August 4, 1945. A close aide to President Yeltsin during his rise to lead Soviet Russia in 1990 and then independent Russia in 1991, he served as First Deputy Prime Minister and then State Secretary to the President of the Russian Federation in 1991–1992. He was a member of parliament and later vice governor of the Novgorod region from 1993 to 1999, and thereupon joined the Federation Council as a senator from 2001 to 2007.
We meet between the Glasgow and Sharm al-Shaykh COPs, at a time when the latest IPCC Report stressed the absolute urgency of action and other studies suggest the situation the world confronts is more serious and the damage being done to the world’s climate may already be becoming irreversible. Moreover, there is a danger that the very real concerns about access to energy and the global economy may trump focus on cutting CO2 emissions because of the rising prices. Actors -- not just governments, but also the private sector, research institutes, civil society, and private individuals -- need to act. The upcoming COP in Sharm al-Shaykh is supposed to look not only for increased commitments to lower greenhouse gas emissions, but at concrete steps being taken to implement commitments that have already been made. Official statements continue to reiterate recognition of the need to limit warming to well below 2 degrees C and to pursue efforts to limit it to 1.5 degrees C, as well as to enhance the global response in support of adaptation to climate impacts. Yet, studies show targets are not being met, that emissions may be greater and increasing faster than previously thought, and that the impacts of global warming are occurring faster than predicted and may be already irreversible.
Maria Fernanda Espinosa moderated the session opened by a keynote address from Abdou Karim Sall, Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development of Senegal representing the President of Senegal and current chairman of the African Union. When the United Nations were created, one of the main goals was to foster peace and security. Over the years, additional challenges came to the fore including climate change, the loss of biodiversity, global health issues, refugee flows and sustainable development. The world will be confronted by multiple climate challenges with global warming on the rise increasing risks to societies and infrastructure. The LDCs including most in Africa are particularly challenged posing the question of the sustainable development model in industrialised countries and its generalisation worldwide. Sustainable development can unite both economic development and addressing climate change through technological innovation and change in consumption habits. Energy transition must head the global agenda with renewables at the centre of Senegal’s “gas to power” strategy. Senegal cannot accept that gas be considered a dirty fossil energy which would inhibit the country’s transition efforts toward clean energy. Equity, inclusion, and international solidarity must become the hallmarks of joint efforts to fulfil the needs of current and future generations. Chiril Gaburici from Moldova noted that the failure of the Paris Accords commitments is due to the absence of proper priorities with industrialisation and arms production still central in government policies. Joseph Muscat from Malta stressed that the world of today is very different from the one in Paris when decisions were taken. Since, Covid-19, the war in Ukraine and post-pandemic effects are leading to food and migration crises which are all interrelated: Climate change is not an isolated component. Mats Karlsson from Sweden worried that political leaders are losing the sense of urgency and resilience to hold out on climate change. The focus has shifted over the last decade from development priorities to geopolitics and geoeconomics. 50 years after Stockholm and 30 years after the UNEP Rio conference, nations have yet to fulfil the goals submitted and endorsed by the world community. Technology and finance are also reasons for non-implementation. Corruption in the energy sector and in many aspects of national economies is a fundamental reason why change is impeded. Risk management must be clarified including the role of Central Banks which need to take climate change into their balance sheets. The moderator underlined that the war in Ukraine is a threat to delivering on climate promises and on the food, energy and finance crises. The price rise of fuels was noted by the panellists accelerating the tension between social dynamics and the need to a just transition. LNG is a case at hand and necessary for such a transition, and sanctions are a gift to developing economies such as India and China with huge new subsidised Russian oil supplies in the next decades lessening their incentives to cleaner and renewable energy. Mats Karlsson added that the attack on Ukraine carries the possibility to accelerate the integration and modernization of Europe including the importance of supporting Ukraine in an enlarged Europe. The EU has already drawn its Green Deal consequences. Double speak must be avoided like Hungary obstructing this integration. Reasons for hope must remain and the young generations are not in despair although worried that the current generations in power are not moving faster enough. Security is broad, common and indivisible and solutions can be found. A narrative of hope is needed with political will and wisdom.
Europe has been the most successful peace project in the last 75 years. The European Union (EU) has brought peace and security to a warring continent and has expanded to take in many new members after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The EU’s policies have also brought prosperity and welfare to its people and has developed peaceful intensified relations from the West to the East. All this was done with great diplomatic virtuosity as the reality of “variable architecture” enabled choice among many of the old and new nations that cover Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and the Southern Caucasus. Thus, the boundaries (and member states) that define the Euro Zone, the EU proper, the EFTA, NATO, Schengen, OSCE and the Council of Europe, etc. are not the same. Many hoped that with the end of the Cold War a new globally activist (or at least regionally activist) EU would emerge. But tensions have been on the rise among all these nations. Not only did the citizens of Europe reject the proposed European constitution, but there are still some members that resent the more modest Maastricht treaty provisions. Furthermore, Brexit has dealt a blow to the vision of a united Europe. Today, Europe faces problems about everything from the security posture of the EU to immigration to what to do about “illiberal democracies” within Europe. But all these issues pale next to the realities of a resurgent Russia that wages shameless war in Ukraine, shrugs off the collective condemnation of the nations and peoples of the world, and revives full-scale war in the heart of Europe. In addition, protracted conflicts such as in Georgia still bedevil the image of peace, security and prosperity for all that seemed almost within reach. All these many issues require rethinking the rosy pictures that prevailed in the recent past, and to focus on the role of Europe and how to bring peace and stability to Eastern Europe, the Western Balkans and the Southern Caucasus.
Zlatko Lagumdzija, the co-moderator, invited President of Albania Ilir Meta to deliver his keynote address: “The EU cannot be stronger without the integration of the Western Balkan countries. There is consensus on the accepted vision that the EU is much more than just an economic market. It is first and foremost a political community which wants to build a peaceful and prosperous future based on shared values. The war in Ukraine is showing that this vision is shared much more than the EU member states. The fact that more countries are seeking and treasuring for EU accession proves this. It is this political future that is at stake. EU leaders cannot escape their responsibilities to make such strategic decisions now. They cannot hide behind technical details when facing vital challenges that are shaking the foundations, values and perspectives. Such historic compromises have happened in the past when European leaders had the courage to make strategic decisions. The EU has enlarged on political grounds many times before widening the geography of peace and not just its economic might. Let us remind ourselves of enlargement towards Greece and later also to the ten countries in Eastern Europe. There were sceptics then as there are sceptics now, but this did not stop through leadership to turn risks into opportunities. The question today is whether there is still such European visionary leadership that understands and embodies European history and its essence of establishment. EU’s actual approach in the Western Balkans deeply suffers from an ambiguity and confusion. Twitter diplomacy with beautiful pictures of happy handshakes and messages is no remedy nor can it alter the aching reality in our region. Sure, the EU cannot suffer from an incapacity the absorb the peoples of the Western Balkans quite marginal in terms of numbers less than Romania. I also believe they don’t lack the leverage or the power to induce democratic and prosperous development in the region, but the EU has suffered from a blurry policy between the Commission and the member states on the real state of affairs in our region. I remain hopeful that this dualism will end in face of current challenges serving to the best interests of the region and the EU itself. At the same time, this moment is an opportunity to reinvigorate EU’s neighbourhood policy and its agenda of cooperation leaving no vacuum in the intersecting interest for peace and stability. But can you have the cohesion and power to rise as a political giant as much as it is an economic one? Yes, it can! Albania supports a strong and united European Union and united Europe enlarging without delay towards the Western Balkans. Therefore, we consider the Berlin Process mechanism as the main catalysers of the EU integration of the Western Balkans. We should focus on implementing faster the Berlin Process and not get distracted and confused by non-inclusive or by non-all-inclusive parallel alternative approaches because the Berlin Process supports the establishment of a common regional market based on the Four Freedoms. All six countries are part of and fully endorse this Process. Only some leaders support the Open Balkan alternative. The Berlin Process has the EU as part of it. The Open Balkans does not. The Berlin Process has financial instruments to back connectivity projects in our region. The Open Balkans does not. The Berlin Process invigorates the enlargement process matching required reform with financial rewards. The Open Balkans presents itself as an alternative to EU accession alienating the region as a hybrid political community. The Berlin Process keeps the six countries of the Western Balkans on the political table of the European Union. A process that has the Union inside it represents the will of our countries. A process that bisects the EU represents the political fears of autocratic leaders of losing their power. Time has shown that in the Western Balkans only an all-inclusive approach works. I would like to greet the clear commitment of the new Chancellor of Germany recently visiting our region on accelerating the Berlin Process and for the importance of the dialogue between Kosovo and Serbia aiming
at not only normalising their relations but also on
the mutual recognition to establish a stable and ir-
reversible European track for the Western Balkans.
We need a strong Euro-Atlantic leadership and
the better coordination than until now of the Eu-
ropean Union and the United States. History has
shown that the geopolitical weight of our region is
huge for the impact of the European and Euro-At-
lantic security and more. The Balkans have been
the Achilles heel of Europe and in such times of
crisis we are going through, third actors particu-
larly Russia will try to influence on the most vul-
nerable and weak points of the region by taking
advantage of the existing differences and ambigu-
ities between the U.S. and the EU. That’s why we
need reengagement and revitalisation of the com-
mon policy of the U.S. and the EU to strength-
en stability and security in the region. Sanctions
must be used by the EU and the U.S. against lead-
ers that undermine peace agreements, call for
border changes that instigate secession and that
promote ethnic and religious hate. The EU and
the U.S. aid and funds should be delivered only
through the respect of European values and stan-
dards. In the context of the current crisis, the un-
provoked aggression of Russia against Ukraine,
European countries should first of all increase
their military budget and create a European force
not in competition to NATO but a complemen-
tary one which will give more voice to the EU in
the international arena and more weight to the ac-
tions of its foreign policy. NATO continues to be
our main security guarantor in terms of defend-
ing the inviolability of borders, sovereignty and
peace within our collective community. NATO
should continue its engagements in Kosovo and
Bosnia-Herzegovina. The EU and the U.S. should
be re-engaged and better coordinated for an effec-
tive dialogue between Serbia and Kosovo resulting
in mutual recognition and the European member-
ship of both countries in the future. We have to
strengthen the NATO perimeter in the Western
Balkan region and to expand towards those coun-
tries that share the same vision and values of the
collective defence Alliance. We need to commit to
EU membership by implementing irreversible re-
forms that empower democratic institutions and
respect fundamental rights, start the accession ne-
gotiations for Albania and North Macedonia, visa
liberalisation for Kosovo people and ensure full
alignment with EU foreign and security policy for
all Western Balkans countries including sanctions
against Russia. We also expect that EU countries
to reinforce democratic accountability in the re-
region with unambiguous statements and assess-
ments. We need to expand the use of the Trans
Adriatic Pipeline (TAP) transporting natural gas
from Azerbaijan to Europe and to promote the Io-
nian Adriatic pipeline, and also to do our best to
invest as much as possible to introduce solar and
renewable energy as an additional alternative to
cover our domestic needs. We see both EU and
NATO as champions of fundamental freedoms and democratic values. It would be a historic fatality if such an architecture fails to resist current challenges due to imperfections and lack of leadership. This moment should instead translate into a new opportunity both for the EU and NATO to further strengthen within the scope of their original establishment as indeed they are too precious to fail especially at this turbulent time.

The co-moderator Susan Elliott invited Ivo Josipovicić from Croatia for his remarks who opened on his dream that the next Baku Forum de-programmes a regular session on the Western Balkans. This implies that corruption be repressed in the region, that nationalism be reduced, that mutual recognition of Kosovo by Serbia be declared, that politicians agree on the future of Bosnia-Herzegovina, that intensive cultural and economic exchanges be fostered in the region, and finally membership of all countries in the EU and NATO. The decision that Ukraine receive EU candidate status impacts on the Western Balkans. Many think it will encourage to give a similar status to the Western Balkan countries as well but opening accession negotiations will take time to reach this goal as shown by Turkey. Unfortunately, the situation is dire. The crucial issue is whether the EU and U.S. can support the reform process over the coming years and, most importantly, whether the political elites will implement these reforms at home and reach for compromise particularly in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Unless the challenges are met, there will be no future member status for these countries.

Boris Tadic from Serbia stressed that to reach reconciliation in the region the precondition is to respect each other and to carry empathy as well as to create prevention mechanisms of problems. With regards to Kosovo, calling for mutual recognition with Serbia hurts ordinary Serbs who consider this region as historic Serbian territory. The reality is that no Serbian leader is going to recognise an independent Kosovo: it cannot be a precondition for EU accession. But if Serbia remains outside, then the EU will be faced with a chronicle problem in the Western Balkans as this country is central in the region: a solution within reality must be sought. Serbia will undertake all necessary reforms, but the West should not push it into an unsustainable situation such as recognition of Kosovo independence whilst violating the integrity and constitution of one’s own country! Such an approach creates implications in the global community and leads to Russia’s recognition of the Lugansk and Donetsk “Peoples Republics” and Crimea’s annex-
-ation which are creating a problem for Ukraine as well as for the Balkans. EU and U.S. declared Kosovo’s unilateral declaration of independence as a fait accompli which is unacceptable. If then Serbian EU accession is put on hold, then China, Turkey and/or Russia will fill the gap. Nowadays, the West is waking up to the West Balkans problem in the light of Ukraine, but scepticism prevails when President Macron is doing all to avoid their future EU integration based on the political reality of enlargement fatigue in his electorate. Recognition of Kosovo independence violated international law. Interests of other countries have to be taken into consideration, which is difficult, but Ukraine is a wakeup call regarding the respect of territorial integrity which applies also to the Western Balkans. The EU cannot change accession preconditions of Serbia every year! When serving as President of Serbia, 70% were in favour of joining the EU. Today this percentage has fallen to 45%! Herein lies the problem

Peter Medgyessy of Hungary put the two questions on “why”, “how” and “what” to expect from joining the EU and, secondly, which kind of European Union? “Why?” if not for reconciliation as between France and Germany after WWII and now applying to the Western Balkans. Giving a membership perspective is important to this process but it is impossible to avoid accession criteria and to share European values. On which kind of Europe, it should become a multi-circle EU represented by a core with common policies required to play an important world role. The second circle would represent those countries not yet ready to fulfil the criteria. The third circle are those looking for closer cooperation with the EU in the economic and financial fields, and the fourth outer circle would be the anti-chambre for those who have a dream knowing that it will take time to join. We need to start speaking about the future of a new world order with the U.S. remaining a vital but diminishing player with the rise of China and India and with Russia remaining ever present in a multipolar world yet bereft of institutions representing this new shift.

Filip Vujanovic of Montenegro noted, when analysing the security situation in the Western Balkans, that the impact of the war in Ukraine must be assessed. Russia’s brutal aggression has endangered the fundamental values of the global order. This war has reopened the issue of the relationship between big and powerful and small and weak countries and the maintenance of peace through mechanisms of collective protection secured globally and regionally. Reform of the United Nations must urgently be undertaken. Russia as a permanent Security Coun-
cil member decided on war with Ukraine. EU enlargement remains a vital part of its policy: the clash between enlargement fatigue in the Union and the waiting to become of candidate countries diminishes Europe’s values. Montenegro has been in the enlargement process over a decade and has opened all chapters, but the situation has worsened since with the enlargement procedure de facto frozen. Five years ago, Montenegro joined NATO which is a precondition for peace in the region. The Berlin Process has created a concept of cooperation in the fields of economy, education, culture, science and research. From the 2017 Trieste Summit to the 2020 Sofia Summit, the European Regional Council and CEFTA allowed for joint cooperation between EU and Western Balkan leaders and the creation of a common regional market, but Serbia, North Macedonia and Albania introduced the new Open Balkans initiative rejected by Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo: misunderstandings and divisions define the new reality.
Sali Berisha from Albania recognised progress in economic integration of the region but not in the security sector due to unhealed wounds of past conflicts and the ghost of ultra-nationalism present which keep conflicts on hold as witnessed by Serbia’s stance on Kosovo, due to a strong Russian influence in the region, and organised crime at highest levels linking autocratic powers and corruption. An agreement between Serbia and Kosovo is vital but two special initiatives went astray and damaged the process: drawing new borders on ethnic lines in the north of Kosovo supported by Russia and George Soros’ Open Society Belgrade and in Brussels and Washington circles opening a Pandora Box in the region. The Open Balkans initiative also strongly supported by Russia also goes against the Berlin Process and was likewise supported by George Soros! The U.S. must be present in the region together with EU and impose an agreement as has been the case of outside powers over the last 150 years in the Balkans.

President Meta responded to the panel remarks by highlighting the necessary focus on Serbia- Kosovo relations and the future of Bosnia-Herzegovina which remain crucial in all current discussions. Regarding international law, the 2010 ICJ Decision recognised the unilateral declaration of independence of Kosovo. Also, the EU cannot invent new rules for Serbian membership or other West Balkan countries, but all domestic problems have to be resolved beforehand.

Zlatko Lagumdžija from and on Bosnia-Herzegovina concluded the panel discussion by underlining that his country reflects surroundings both in the neighbourhood and in the Euro-Atlantic area at large, and surroundings get likewise reflected in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The EU is the biggest peace project in history based on progressing and enlarging not territory by conquest but by implementing a certain set of values on what the EU is all about and notably the European Convention on Human Rights and Freedoms. If the EU and Western Balkans do not share a common dream on their shared future, then our dreams will not become reality.
The Middle East used to be synonymous with the Arab Israeli Conflict and the issue of the Palestinians. But the last 20 years or so have seen a broad realignment along a confrontation between the West and radical Islamic terrorism, and between the Sunni and Shia divide among predominantly Muslim majority countries, and widespread instabilities following the “Arab Spring” of 2011. Today tensions, if not outright wars, are in many lands from Morocco and the SADR in the west, on to Libya, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, Yemen, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, and on to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Amid all this, much is changing between Israel and the Arabs. Saudi Arabia and the Houthis have a two-month ceasefire in Yemen, which could lead to ending that war. The non-Arab but regionally involved powers of Turkey and Iran also have an important presence. The US withdrawal from Afghanistan and Russia’s strong involvement in Syria further highlight the complexities of a proper reading of the lay of the land and the many intersecting lines of interests of many state and non-state actors.
The moderator Amre Moussa from Egypt introduced the keynote speaker, Secretary General of the League of Arab States Ahmed Aboul Gheit, and invited him to deliver his address:

“The Middle East and the world at large are approaching a perfect storm with discussions held during the Forum on a coming global economic recession in the aftermath of the Covid pandemic which in ongoing and can re-erupt at any point in time as alerted by the WHO Director General. Then the war in Ukraine with its ramifications and agony has added two new problems: food security and supply of grains and wheat as well as the energy security problem which announces this perfect storm. As representative of the Arab League, how will these dire developments affect the Arab countries, a region already engulfed in a storm of its own in the last decade with its aftershocks and repercussions still present. Some countries faced disintegration and descended into outright civil wars; others are still struggling through a painful process of transition with uncertain results. The security environment has worsened with polarisation acute between regional players and the risk of confrontation is worryingly high upon us.

The Middle East has a long history of instability and conflict. However, for the first time since the establishment of the modern Arab nation states a century ago, the very concept of nation-state is called into question and is severely challenged. Islamists in our region pose the greatest threat to some Arab countries and societies and carry their own agenda that is diametrically opposed to the notion of a nation-state based on citizenship and not on religion concepts. The clash was inevitable, not over interests or politics but over the nature of the state as a political body, its ideological essence, and its future.

Some Arab states were already vulnerable due to a number of socio-economic failings. The 2011 earthquake exposed their accumulated failures and weak points. The result, as we witnessed in Syria, in Libya and in Yemen in particular, was the severe weakening of central authority leading to civil wars and creating a dangerous security vacuum. In some cases, as in in Syria, this vacuum was filled by regional and international powers who sent their troops to occupy parts of the country and also by the terrorist groups who managed at some point to declare a so-called “caliphate”. In other cases, such as Libya, militias sadly won the day and established staying power for themselves, and as shown in Yemen, a country with great strategic importance with the Bab al-Mandab Strait opening the Red Sea and leading to the Suez Canal, one militia managed to take control of the capital in 2014. This new reality has adversely impacted all regional dynamics with civil wars tending to spill over and inviting foreign powers eager to carve out a sphere of influence for their own. Regional players sought to benefit from this new reality claiming and stating that all what they were doing was just to defend their national interest!

From an Arab perspective, Iran’s role in the region is particularly worrying. During the last six years as Secretary General of the League of Arab States, I experienced first hand how Iran’s activities and regional policy prolonged conflicts making
them more intractable and harder to settle. The crux of the matter has always been Iran’s support for certain armed groups and militias within Arab societies, countries, and the region. I am convinced that Iran’s agenda is nationalist in essence however it formulates such an agenda in sectarian terms championing the Shia cause everywhere and granting itself the right to intervene in Arab countries under this religious banner. No sovereign country, Arab or otherwise, would accept such interference in its internal affairs. Arab countries have made it clear once and again that they aspire to a balanced relationship with Tehran based on mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs.

On Yemen, a two-months ceasefire has been recently declared and extended for another two months, an important step forward despite serious violations by the Houthis. Meeting the President of the Presidential Council a few days ago, he made clear his pursuit of a peace agenda to end the conflict: peace in Yemen is within reach if the Houthis renounce their maximalist demands and cut off their regional affiliations. A political solution should include all the political components in the country including the Houthis themselves. Libya is in difficulty as well as Syria with no prospects in the immediate future for a breakthrough in these two countries.

The war in Ukraine has had a knock-on effect that is felt all over the world. The Middle East is no exception. Some may think that a divided world order might at least in theory provide some room for manoeuvre to middle and small powers as it happened in the late 1950s, and the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s with the Movement of the Non-Aligned and the competition between the Soviet Union and the Western Bloc. Polarisation on the international level will put immense pressures on countries to join in this or that camp: sitting on the fence will become increasingly difficult and grow more costly as we are all beginning to realise. Some vital interests could be threatened such as food security or the availability of energy at acceptable cost. The Ukraine crisis might nevertheless hold an opportunity for all developing countries to work together and create common agendas on specific issues. The Arab League is looking into strategies to achieve food security through a collect-

-tive framework working on studies on how to enhance our ability to produce what would guarantee food for all Arab citizens.

A final word on Palestine. I am deeply concerned that the Palestinian question is being moved to the backburner as a result of polarisation on the international level and other pressing regional issues. I am still convinced that the Palestinian question remains the key to regional stability in the Middle East. Absent a final and just settlement to this core issue leading to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state on the 1967 borders where East Jerusalem is the capital. Any cooperation framework will remain fragile and reversible if we do not reach a conclusion to the Palestinian problem. A future agenda in the Middle East should not leave the Palestinians behind. The young Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza have the right to a better future that meet their aspirations. Now I observe the behaviour of the current Israeli government. I am shocked to see a government with that internal conflict inside the land between the river and the Mediterranean telling the other party ‘I will not see you and I will not discuss anything with you’! That is saddening because in all honesty and candour I tell the Israeli people, and I have been dealing with General Barack for so many decades, like Amre Moussa: do you want an Israel with one state and two peoples, one larger population under the yoke of another population, an apartheid because in 2040 the Palestinians will exceed the Israelis in numbers? How will you deal with this situation? Would you expel them out of their land which the world will not accept. Maybe the world has been over 50 years accepting the occupation but when violence reaches that point of expelling people out of their territory, do you expect the world to accept? So, my constant advice to Israel has been to settle now and finish with it because in a certain point in time there will be 15 million Palestinians and only 10 million Israelis and if it one democratic state with two peoples, becoming Prime Minister of Israel in 2050 will be a Palestinian: settle now will be better for you”.

The moderator highlighted the importance of the speech related to the consideration on new ways and means to address the Palestinian Question which cannot remain as such. This point has
been addressed many times with the Israeli elite and/or the Israeli authorities talking about an independent state of Palestine with East Jerusalem as its capital and West Jerusalem as the capital of Israel but within one city. We hope for discussions and a possible agreement, but the Secretary General underlined we couldn’t reach any deal. The situation in the Middle East and in the Arab and Muslim world raises many question marks but one is clear at least: this region is part and parcel of the world calling for the same principles in the same UN Charter playing an active role in all UN branches building a new world and a renovated international system.

Djomart Otorbaev from Kyrgyzstan turned to Central Asia and underlined that his country has problems with the Islamic movement confronted by the neighbouring Islamic State of Afghanistan, a Central Asian country, not South Asian. The current Taliban rulers with their policies on human rights have no relation with Islamic principles, and their governance is worsening as highlighted by the UN with terrorists flowing into Afghanistan, traffic of narcotics doubling and terrorists seeing the opportunity to develop their ideologies in a country gripped by starvation and poverty leading to refugees streaming out to neighbouring countries. The Arab countries should influence the Taliban and recall that during the Abbasid Caliphate they saved Central Asia from the Chinese invasion at the Battle of Talas in 751 in Kyrgyzstan which allowed for the growth of the Silk Road. These initial links need to be rekindled faced by today’s challenges.

Ehud Barak from Israel reminded that his country is committed first and foremost to defend itself and its people seeing itself as a small minority in the region. The real split in the Arab and Muslim world is among and between the extremist fanatics and proud and enlightened moderates looking forward, not backward which is a deeper divide than between Sunnis and Shias. The sources of the problem are basically in Iran and in Syria and in the failing states of Iraq, Lebanon, and Yemen. The moderate “front” countries play a leading role in promoting stability which is more important than show-casting a Western-style practice of democracy. The Arab League countries and the OIC should show the way creating a majority of scholars of Islam interpreting the Quran which is humanistic and moderate in essence. Iran remains major source of the threat in the Middle East including in Syria, Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Hamas in Gaza. If Iran becomes a nuclear threshold power, this will not lead to a strike on Israel but inevitably drive to nuclear proliferation of other regional powers such as Turkey, Egypt or Saudi Arabia which will destroy the NPT regime. Nuclear power protects the longevity of the Iranian regime as it does for North Korea. ISIS will not resuscitate and was too great a cost to the Muslim world, but extremism will linger on such as in Afghanistan. A strong debate is ongoing in Israel as to how to disengage from the Palestinians and promote peace within the Abraham Agreements but never lose sight for the Two-States solution which is also in the Israeli interest in strengthening a Zionist Jewish democratic state which cannot function in a single bi-national state with an overwhelming Muslim majority.
Yashar Yakish from Turkey divided the problems of the Middle East into centuries-old problems between the Sunnis and the Shias and the decades-old Palestinian Question, and the present burning problems of Syria, Libya and Yemen. The Sunni and Shia worlds will in the long run reach an agreement as after the Thirty Years War in Europe. Palestine is also a long-term issue. The U.S. attitude in the Trump and Biden Administrations are not going into a right direction such as by moving the embassy to Jerusalem in contradiction of the 1947 settlement whereby this city was designated as corpus separatum. The Two-States solution could resolve the issue as well as the Abraham Accords. On Syria, outside powers of U.S., Russia, Iran and Turkey are fuelling the internal conflict. Turkey has yet to declare an exit strategy. An additional problem with Syria is the Kurdish issue which is a broader Middle Eastern problem with large Kurdish minority communities present in many countries contributing to the shaping of the future Middle East. The Kurdish question in Syria will depend on the final outcome of the crisis with different scenarios such as via municipal decentralisation or enclaves in the north or the creation of an autonomous regions like in Iraq or, finally, full independence but hardly predictable in the near future.

The Moderator underlined the importance to the Arab world of Iraq’s territorial integrity as a sine qua non for peace in the area, including for Turkey.

Jan Kubis from Slovakia and former UN Envoy to the Region commented on the discussion and started by the issue of Palestine which cannot be avoided when addressing the Middle East stability and global affairs. Secondly, a perfect storm is in the making with no social contract in most countries with a gap growing between the ruling elites and the needs of the people: the political systems are sclerotic, and populations are protesting ushering failed states. Situations can be calmed down but only for a while. Elections are not a panacea as witness Iraq and Lebanon which do not create functioning governments and bring back old elites that brought disaster to the countries in the first instance. Thirdly, weak and failed states lead to non-state armed factions dictating their will also on war and peace as shown by Lebanon beyond Hezbollah: this is fertile ground for foreign interference. The Middle East is interconnected with North and Sub-Saharan Africa which are facing the same perfect storm who are compelled to choose sides either with the West and NATO or with China and Russia, the latter now destroying.
the rules-based international order: fence sitting is no longer possible. Finally, on the nuclear issue, the countries that undersigned the Budapest Memorandum failed Ukraine which had renounced its nuclear weapons feeding the thinking in many countries and compounded by the absence of Iran's nuclear programme issue which adds additional risks. Other perfect storms remain at the top of the agenda for the international community from climate change to water scarcity leading to waves of migration and refugees that will destabilise entire regions.

The moderator invited for final comments from the panel. Amre Moussa stressed the nuclear question which should usher an obvious zone free from nuclear weapons in the Middle East. If Israel declares its intentions, under certain conditions of understanding and negotiating, to relinquish nuclear weapons, Iran will have to stop. On the Two-States solution for the Palestine Question, one can no longer talk about it while the Palestinian territory is being eroded bit by bit which leads many to consider a single Israeli-Palestinian state with all its repercussions that will ensue. The fait accompli Israeli plan of occupied territories with second-class citizens is untenable. Are the Abraham Accords a win-win situation for Israel? The young educated public opinion in the Arab world is not convinced in the absence of any single peace proposal coming from Israel. The time has come for Israel to discuss with the Palestinians if it wishes to join the Arab world and Middle East at large. Jan Kubis noted that only goodwill and openness to dialogue can be the way ahead as shown by Egypt and Israel. On international institutions and the role of the UN, these should not be abandoned when searching for solutions: they are irreplaceable tools lest outside malign players intervene where might become right. In Syria, is the UN format better than the Astana format? Prudence should prevail on destroying a possibly paralyzed UN with its Security Council unable to take decisions, but one must avoid crises to spill into open conflicts. Finally, Afghanistan must not become an unmanaged chaotic black hole where its people pay the price and was furthermore betrayed. Ehud Barack recalled the 1947 UN Partition of Palestine and the ensuing war waged by the Arab countries on Israel. The Middle East remains a tough neighbourhood and the lessons learned by Israel will always be to protect itself as it does not intend to disappear. Israel will welcome the nuclear recommendation of Amre Moussa when that it will be a rule respected by the whole world and when Israel will be at peace with all its Middle East neighbours, such as between Sweden and Norway, or when the "eternal peace" of
Immanuel Kant comes about. One state of Palestine is a danger for Israel and deep differences in the Israeli public and body polity exist. The Abraham Accords have changed the attitude of Israelis to Arabs as a whole. For Djoomart Otorbaev, educating the young Arab populations in the 21st century must become the primary task and goal.

Ahmed Aboul Gheit concluded the panel discussion with the following remarks. On the nuclear threat, if Israel had taken the same path as South Africa in 1994 in relinquishing its nuclear capabilities, then the Middle East would not be in today’s situation because this led some states reflecting on the need to possess nuclear deterrence. Libya relinquished its nuclear programme and Iran is on the threshold of reaching that capability with Turkey that could follow despite its NATO membership. Important Arab players will not stay behind. Hence, it is not too late for Israel to follow the 1994 path.

On Palestine, Israel needs great a leader like President Sadat or Prime Minister Rabin assassinated in 1995 which deterred Prime Ministers Barack and Olmert from not trying harder to reach the solution and the settlement they wished for. Addressing Ehud Barack: “You told Amre Moussa at Lod airport in April 1999 before the Israeli elections that ‘the moment I am elected I will run after a settlement with the Palestinians’ and offered Camp David in July 2000 which wasn’t enough. Ehud Olmert and Foreign Minister Livni did not have the courage to go the extra mile: I am calling for a great leader like Ben Gurion to settle the Palestine Question”. Ehud Barack rejected this presentation as not being congruent with the facts whereupon the moderator closed the panel discussion.
The 20th century saw an unprecedented concern with Human Rights among the members of the international community. The 21st century witnessed a historic consensus on the direction of development policy. First, all the countries of the world agreed on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to cover 2000–2015, and then they agreed on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to cover 2015–2030. By 2015 it appeared that the world community was doing well in confronting poverty and hunger. But the improvement in the global distributions between countries (as well as a large part of the reduction in overall poverty figures globally) was largely due to the exceptional performance of China, which recorded double-digit rates of growth and became the second largest economy in the world. China largely abolished extreme poverty within its borders and created an enormous middle class of hundreds of millions of people. But excluding China shows that all countries saw an increase in inequality both within and between countries.

The 17 SDGs take a comprehensive view of development and implicitly promote a Human-centred Development Paradigm that in its commitment to the abolition of poverty and hunger must also confront the corrosive effects of inequality. The SDGs remind us of the importance on addressing inequalities, starting with gender inequality and negative impacts on minorities, be they ethnic or religious minorities. However, in a general sense, inequalities in terms of the gaps between the rich and the poor have dominated political concerns in many parts of the world. Today, looking back at our efforts to put all countries on the path prescribed by the SDGs we must recognize that this has been against a backdrop of forty years of globalization.
And since the 1980 Reagan–Thatcher ideological crusade on behalf of the private sector and their attacks on the role of government in economic development, including efforts to limit regulations on economic activity, the world has witnessed an increase in inequality in practically every country. Globalization measured in massively increased trade, financial flows and communications resulted in the many cases in the rich getting richer and the gap between the rich and the poor getting larger. In addition, practically every country has experienced larger inequality in wealth than the already large inequalities in income that bedevil the social discourse in many countries.

This extreme inequality was exposed most dramatically by the Covid-19 pandemic. Public health for all proved to be illusive, and the poor – both in the rich and in the poor countries – are the most vulnerable. Indeed, it is troubling for many that the super-rich got even richer during the pandemic. Many of them, like the super-rich corporations that dominate our markets, pay hardly any taxes. The pandemic, its impact on supply chains, and the economic effects of government lockdown policies adopted to limit the spread of the disease have all pushed back many millions of people into extreme poverty and hunger. Humanitarian help is necessary to avoid famine in many places.

Extreme inequality is corrosive. It hardens the attitudes of the rich and powerful towards the poor and deprived. It builds acceptance of the incongruity of wealth amidst misery and exclusion, undermines the very notions of social justice and social cohesion, makes a mockery of fairness, and leads to the slippery path of class warfare as the only means of redress. Indeed, recent studies have confirmed our suspicions that far from being a necessary corollary to compensate the talented and inventive – those forces in society that propel society forward – excessive inequality was inefficient and was associated with a variety of social ills. We now have no less an authority than the IMF backing that view with empirical evidence. The 2015 IMF report states:

“Our analysis suggests that the income distribution itself matters for growth as well. Specifically, if the income share of the top 20 percent (the rich) increases, then GDP growth actually declines over the medium term, suggesting that the benefits do not trickle down. In contrast, an increase in the income share of the bottom 20 percent (the poor) is associated with higher GDP growth. The poor and the middle class matter the most for growth via a number of interrelated economic, social, and political channels”.

While absolute equality is both an unattainable and undesirable goal, some level of equality to provide a minimum complement of access and capabilities to all citizens is and should be a desirable goal for any society where the building up of the positive attributes of social cohesion, solidarity and mutual respect is being effectively pursued. While abolishing poverty and hunger remain a central goal, concerned social scientists today look to the whole range of SDGs and increasingly a whole social manifesto is being pursued.
The moderator Francis O’Donnell introduced the panel by underlining according to ILO that global labour income is falling as a share of total income at about 50%. 3.5 billion of workers are hardly earning any more than what is earned from capital! Wealth being six times what income is remains a big issue with regards to rising inequalities worldwide.

Mats Karlsson from Sweden started by stressing that globalisation did not create inequality but poor national policies through the capture of profits and corruption did, and weak global governance which failed to use the instruments that exist. The dangerous forces of de-globalisation are at work. Global institutions must be protected and enhanced. Social contracts must purposefully be pursued at national level. Gender inequality is a core issue with risks of reversal. Another issue pertains to diversity, races and minorities which is a rights issue: likewise here, reversal is being risked with the rise of a disrespect of human rights in some societies.
The main issue is the management of global interdependence characterised by a period of reversal and further risk never witnessed before. Deglobalisation is happening and is real, fuelled by inequality which derails trust in the globalisation process as shown in the U.S., a country incapable in dealing with inequality with the direct consequence of stepping out of multilateralism which was the Trump agenda. The driving forces for the world are falling apart. The world is not divided between states of liberal democracy and states of authoritarianism but rather as a fight within countries. Globalisation was fractured before but the legitimacy of the growth of authoritarianism in the world is a danger as witness in Xi's China and in Modi's India. Africa faces deep societal choices which they have yet to decide upon where its population will become larger than China and India together: focussing on Africa is focussing on the future of the world. The value of global institutions must be central. Reforms in the UN institutions remain invaluable, but they will never work unless nations want them to work. Attacks on the WTO which underpinned market globalization that was sought and had created so much value is dangerous for sustaining an interdependent world compounded by the new technologies which require a better handling such as taxation norms underpinning exactly national public policy which is the way one embeds a social contract. Practices and peer pressure can be more efficient as tools than legal treaties aiming for the highest levels. Social contracts can be different, but the primary area is within the nation such as through the respect of national borders so that national governments can work and build a better globalisation.

The moderator noted that the richest 1% persons now own 46% of the world's wealth and invited Mikayil Jabbarov from Azerbaijan to address the Forum.
Governments are often faced by the difficult choice of growing poverty or increased inequality especially in the developing countries. Current successful economic models lead also to rising inequalities. Is greater danger prevalent between wealth or inequality of income? Wealth inequality seems more dangerous and most of the tools rest in national jurisdictions which don’t concur in the sense of purpose as they are in competition for tax regimes, economic activity and prof its shifting. With regards to values in societies, in many countries inequalities of wealth and income are figured differently. Some tools can be universal such as an OECD tax policy but some need to be context specific. Bridging of inequalities by providing a minimal common good and a public service is a prerequisite. On the Azerbaijan experience, lower living standards rather than income disparities was the issue at the onset of independence.

Also 1/7 persons became either refugees or IDPs which was a great vulnerability and required working at and bridging the gap of a very fast developing hydrocarbon-based economy. This significantly deprived the population and lead the government to focus on inclusion and ensuring a strong social safety net as well as investing in education and human capital, and in minimal wages and pensions. “Vision 2030” of Azerbaijan focuses on inclusive development and an inclusive competitive economy requiring reform with unpopular decisions in taxation and within the overall business environment.

Rosalia Arteaga Serrano from Ecuador underlined the two cancers assailing the democratic system and societies at large which are their asymmetries and corruption. Asymmetries and discriminations are related to the treatment given to women, to ethnic and religious minorities and socially and economic depressed sectors arresting normal development of societies often at the origin of conflicts and confrontations. Latin America has been described as the most asymmetric continent with economic and social inequalities carrying a burden that governments have not been able to overcome. What prevails is a poor distribution of wealth fuelling confrontations and struggles: wealth accumulation in the face of shortage is unhealthy and points to permanent sources of conflict. Solutions are manifold such as tax reform, access to quality education with the help of technological innovation, or to policies proponing gender equality. A look from a “glocal” perspective – the local meshed with the global -- is needed providing the benefits of globalisation with a local vision that sinks its roots in the identities of each diverse people contributing to essential knowledge at times of social co-existence.

The moderator invited Katalin Bogyay from Hungary to address the discrimination plight of the Roma communities in Europe. When talking about inequalities, one needs to think about compassion which should be a topic in the training of children at schools. From a multilateral perspective, many UN programmes have been launched dealing with the topic of inequality such as within the SDGs and the protection of minorities totalling today 1 billion people in the world living with disabilities but who have rights universally recognised since 2008.
in a UN Convention. UN Women has also set up many programmes to overcome gender inequalities. The role of women in peace talks needs also to be underlined, as exemplified by women during the pandemic: their priorities must not be forgotten once peace returns.

Garry Jacobs recalled the long and ongoing struggle in the U.S. to overcome inequalities and discrimination since its independence and when the world community came together for the first time to proclaim the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 but was not given any legal power of enforcement. In 2015, 193 countries adopted the 17 SDGs witnessing the evolution of the global society in terms of the recognition of the fundamental importance of human rights and values as an individual or within a society. Inequalities is a process on the move with rising inequalities in some areas and addressing them in others. Globalisation is an issue because capitalism has reduced the sovereign power of nation-states to do internally what they want with their economies: competition is on the rise with a Wild West in the global society where money, business and wealth can move freely to more advantageous shores. This leads to the issue of multilateralism with the question of who will create and enforce a global system that is a relatively equal playing field for all? It will have to be a collective negotiation of the world communities which explains that global powers are less willing to strengthen the multilateral system however important it is to the solution of inequality. Our system is driven not by what is right so much as by where the power is in society, whether in democracies or in autocracies: Where money is the main determinant of where the power, policy and decision-making is. Social power is critical but how can it be shifted to individuals? More economic growth, the greater inequalities under climate change enhancing greater insecurity to all as was underlined by the 2022 UNDP report on New Threats to Human Security highlighting the needed shift from national security to human security.
The moderator wondered why no binding obligations on the corporate sector existed which carries an enormous role in the process of climate change and passed the baton to Laimdota Straujuma from Latvia who noted that the world is in a comparable situation as during the 2008 economic crisis. The small Baltic countries were grateful to join the EU in 2004 and NATO which allowed for their security and economic development. The combined effects of globalisation, rapid technopolitical change, digitalisation and the Covid pandemic created greater inequalities. Latvia understands the desire of former Soviet states like Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia to join EU. Latvia shows the highest OECD inequality level, and its GINI index is even increasing so regional cohesion policies in the country are likewise an urgent task.

The moderator compared the process of EU accession and implementation of its “acquis communautaire” to the UN MDGs/SDGs goals and concluded that this alignment process brought the candidate countries much closer to achieving these UN goals. Emil Constantinescu from Romania recalled his life under the “dictatorship of the proletariat” preaching total equality with the well-known results which explains his strong support for a capitalist market economy in the post-communist era resulting in an overall increase of the standard of living but with large discrepancies between the very rich and the rest of society. Any political system generates billionaires, and their assets increase after any crisis because they don’t pay the costs of the crises but instead the populations, the socialisation of risks, and furthermore decide with increasing arrogance on how to run societies and redistribute their financial resources. Older generations of billionaires did not display with ostentation their wealth and respected academic milieux with their philanthropic support. The toxic triangle for democracies of business-political leadership-media was preferred in the past to influence government; today they wish to replace governments having better access to information than state organisations. The real crisis in today’s democracies is the question on who actually takes decisions. On solutions, Adam Smith is quoted universally but very few remember that he had published an earlier book on morality in economies.

The moderator concluded the panel discussion on the three keys put forward by Jeffrey Sachs in dealing with globalisation and rising inequalities: (1) publicly guaranteed access to essential services and
economic rights being health care, education, basic infrastructure; (2) social protection funding for vulnerable groups (families with young children, the indigent, disabled and elderly); (3) greatly increased SDGs funding for LDCs from high-income countries especially through a major expansion of developing financing of the multilateral development banks and other development finance institutions.
We all know the Universal Declaration of Human rights (UDHR) and that the ideas spelled out in the UDHR have been codified in international treaties that form the basis of an important part of International Law. These include two major covenants that were launched by the General Assembly of the UN in 1966 and came into force in 1976, one covering Civil and Political Rights, and the other covering Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. In addition, The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child were also adopted by the UN. But critics pointed out that there was no mechanism for anyone to seek redress under these treaties. So in 2008, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to create the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights which establishes complaint and inquiry mechanisms for the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It entered into force in 2013 and by 2018 the Protocol had 45 signatories.

Generally speaking, democratic systems and supportive states are best positioned to ensure the Human Rights of their citizens. Such governments, whether parliamentary or presidential, constitutional monarchies or federal structures, tend to have a number of distinctive attributes. These attributes include: (i) freedom of assembly, association and speech, (ii) inclusiveness and equality, (iii) citizenship (iv) consent of the governed, (v) voting rights, (vi) majority rule and minority rights, (vii) rule of law and equality before the law, and obviously (viii) freedom from unwarranted governmental deprivation of the right to life and liberty. In the last part of the 20th century, and especially following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the number of countries seeking to establish such systems increased. But in the aggregate,
the expansion of democracy and human rights that had so significantly advanced in the 1990s was arrested. The rise of authoritarian regimes in many parts of the world, including authoritarian political movements within the scope of the Western alliance, posed new problems that had been blithely assumed away in the 1990s. Accordingly, we propose to focus the discussions of this session on the overarching topic of human rights, with democratic governance as a foundation, as democracy confronts challenges ranging from a rise in far-right movements in their own politics and even the establishment of populist or authoritarian regimes both globally and in the West. These movements, sometimes referred to as populist, tend to rely on propaganda, promoting fear, victimization and arguments about what are sometimes called the culture wars to promote fear of minorities and immigration, all of which have been amplified through the very rapid growth of social media. Proper management of these new realities are essential to protect democratic governance and ensure human rights at a time when many of these alienated citizens query the viability and legitimacy of their governments. Some thoughtful people are even asking about the validity of a democratic system exposed to a constant barrage of falsehoods and lies.
The moderator Ismael Serageldin framed the panel discussion on issues of values in the light of the new challenges of the 21st century and noticed the alienation of significant parts of the citizenry from the democratic systems that it used to endorse with fervour, as well as a gap between decision-making elites and populations in many countries.

Petar Stoyanov from Bulgaria opened his remarks on the Russian aggression against Ukraine which challenges democracies but, albeit its failings, continue to be the most attractive system around the world. The greatest threat to democracy today is not based on ideology or facts but on a pessimistic and cynical worldview confusing people with multiplied messages creating distrust, fear and negativism. Democracies do not go to war at each other and preserve peace and are remedies for the new challenges in the 21st century. Kolinda Grabar-Kitarovic from Croatia focussed on the backsliding of democracy in Western societies fuelled by the erosion of trust into institutions and into people which remains the basis of human relations and of the functioning of
any democracy. The way forward is to re-establish that trust with accountability and credibility of the political elites, to find ways to reconnect with people which is not necessarily "populism", to be careful on messaging both at the domestic and international levels acknowledging that democracy cannot be imposed but welcoming EU candidacy status to Ukraine whilst raising disappointed in the Western Balkans and finally to strengthen institutions at all levels as well as to protect values. NGIC co-chair Vaira Vike-Freiberga from Latvia underlined that democracy as a concept implies different levels of understanding and definition as well as its realisations with equality before just and principled laws as absolutely the most important where the inherent rights of human beings are respected. From Plato's Philosopher-King forbidding poetry to the absolute monarch closer to a U.S. president than a president in a parliamentary system like Latvia shows the different interpretations of democracy. Why do citizens feel distant and disappointed in their politicians if only because precisely the democratic system allows those who are willing to go into politics and to stand for office and get elected to do the best job they can according to their convictions. The Opposition and journalists and media expose their failures casting a critical eye on their leaders where modern media often takes over representative democracy. The high demands placed on those who accept in a representative democracy to take on the weight of taking decisions with the active presence and advice of civil servants must be undertaken in a system of checks and balances. Living in a democracy is complex and requires permanent debate and improvement.
Sabina Aliyeva from Azerbaijan informed the participants on the national Human Rights Day celebrated this very day and underlined the importance of the Ombudsman as a non-judicial protection mechanism bridging state bodies, the population and civil society. Turning to current challenges on human rights protection, serious problems and double standards in the prosecution of perpetrators of the most serious crimes persist with states that are not subjected to any international pressure for their criminal actions. The silence of the international community and international organisations leads to wars and conflicts resulting in gross violations of human rights and freedoms. The UN must develop flexible mechanisms for prompt enforcement of decisions and resolutions and the necessary bringing to justice all those responsible for crimes against peace and humanity and war crimes. For 30 years, the world community turned a blind eye to the difficulties faced by Azerbaijan as a country and a nation as a result of aggression and occupation which resulted in environmental crimes, planting of land mines, acts of vandalism on the historical, cultural and religious heritage, crimes committed during the war against civilians and the killing of children…; these reports have been sent to the world community to be analysed fully leading the war crimes perpetrators to face justice. The Ombudsman and national human rights institutions carry responsibilities including to participate in international law-making process and to promote, protect and monitor human rights as well as to implement international agreements and international law at domestic level. The moderator highlighted the creation of an International Court of Justice and an International Criminal Court, but the protection of human rights remains work in progress at all levels. Hikmet Cetin from Turkey noted a recent downturn in the popularity and effectiveness of democracy fuelled by Covid-19, economic hardship, climate change, irregular migration and income inequality within and between countries. Democracy is in crisis with the rise of populist leaders. Secular and science-based education is essential to counter this worrisome trend.

Farrida Allaghi from Libya speaking from her heart has been dreaming for a better Arab world over the last 60 years but remains a region in a confusing state balancing between hope and despair whilst recognising achievements in some areas. The time has come to be bold and say “enough is enough”: the U.S. and the West cannot ask for human rights in the Arab world when most activists are imprisoned at home or when corruption is pervasive with “business as usual” as leitmotiv of major global corporations. Saying “no” has led her to 40 years in exile but Libya today after the “Arab Spring” is in a “crazy mess” no longer in its own hands and dominated by male fanatics. Chiril Gaburici from Moldova noted failures in solving global inequality, instability and security which should be central to human rights efforts in overcoming these challenges. A new social culture is needed less focused on competition but more on cooperation and built on trust and compromise through education as an essential vehicle.
Olena Tregub from Ukraine recalled the plight of the Azovstal plant in Mariupol and wondered whether the abstract notion of democracy and freedom could be contemplated in such dramatic circumstances? The 2005 Orange Revolution and the 2014 Revolution of Dignity witness to Ukraine’s fight for freedom and democracy, in contrast to Russia which intends to eradicate this country and is committing genocide with 17 000 criminal investigations on war crimes ongoing and with rape as a common tool. In order to have rights, one needs to fight for them!

The moderator concluded the session by highlighting the main points of the panel on mutual respect, no double standards, human rights laws needing to be fought for at all levels and not allowing impunity to take root, equality before the law, re-establishing trust in institutions as well as in each other and combating cynicism instilled by propaganda centres which erode democracy. To conclude, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is an inspirational document that supplements the vision of the sovereign state: human rights must become human security. The rule of law must be linked to justice. For society to advance and make decisions, dialogue is a prerequisite and can only be undertaken in a democratic system. With social media, everybody has become a producer of content of knowledge on the net and a consumer at the same time.
The impact of the war in Ukraine is not only having an impact on the energy markets, but also has an impact on the global food supply since both Ukraine and Russia are major exporters of food. Prices of basic commodities such as wheat are spiking. This has a major negative impact on developing countries who are food importers. It affects the abilities of humanitarian assistance organizations as well who must find more resources to cope with an increasing number of the poor and the hungry around the world. Chief among these is the World Food Program (WFP) which is the world’s largest distributor of food to the hungry. The UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) is the international organization tasked with dealing with the developmental aspects of these issues. The FAO has developed a global strategy based around the “Four Betters”, namely (i) better production, (ii) better nutrition, (iii) better environment, and (iv) better lives. It is also important to remember that the bulk of the poor are still rural, although the urban poor are increasing rapidly. However, it has been said that the best program to help the urban poor is to lower the price of food and increase its availability in the cities since they spend a large part of their limited income on buying food. Yet how can we increase the supply of food and help the rural poor as well, the farmers who produce the food? Primarily by improving the productivity of the small-holder farmer so that his harvests increase faster than the price of the commodity is coming down. Thus, the FAO’s first focus on production is well targeted. So is the focus on nutrition, since better nutritional content is essential for the proper development of a whole generation of children. The focus on the environment is extremely important. The food and agriculture sector (broadly defined to include crops, forestry, and fishing/aquaculture) currently contributes about 15% of global GHG emissions and thus is part of the climate change problem. sequestration of carbon. That said, the whole issue of climate change will require a separate meeting, where issues of mitigation and adaptation can be discussed.
However, there is solid reason to believe that it can be part of the solution: it can help significantly in the sequestration of carbon. That said, the whole issue of climate change will require a separate meeting, where issues of mitigation and adaptation can be discussed.

By addressing these three “betters” the FAO would also be helping with the fourth better “better lives” for it would be contributing mightily to the fight against poverty and hunger. Accomplishing that requires a much greater global collaboration in bringing together the world community collectively as well as individual countries in implementing these strategies and bringing to bear the best of science on the challenges facing the poor.

The Moderator Hakima El Haite from Morocco underlined at the outset that overcoming poverty and hunger are the greatest challenges across the globe with 811 million without access to enough food, and 50 million facing emergency levels of hunger, although sufficient food is produced in the world to cover all global needs. Is the SDG 2 aim to end world hunger by 2030 feasible?
The Moderator Hakima El Haite from Morocco underlined at the outset that overcoming poverty and hunger are the greatest challenges across the globe with 811 million without access to enough food, and 50 million facing emergency levels of hunger, although sufficient food is produced in the world to cover all global needs. Is the SDG 2 aim to end world hunger by 2030 feasible?

U.S. Ambassador Cindy McCain stressed that the world is facing the most serious food crisis in 70 years fuelled by Covid, climate change and conflict. 200 million were at risk before the war in Ukraine which has now increased by 40 million in 2022. Time has come to invest in resilience and innovation and to promote climate-smart agriculture and water management. Inam Karimov from Azerbaijan underlined that Azerbaijan is conducting a policy that covers all the spheres of responsible and inclusive agricultural development. The Minister highlighted FAO’s latest alarming report on water and land resources when in the last 20 years the world lost 3% of its land resources although agricultural production increased by 53% during the same period. In the coming 20 years, 50% more needs to be produced to feed a future 10 billion global population. Digital transformation by increasing efficiency and productivity in agriculture will be an essential measure to overcome the food challenge and induce young generations to join in this activity. Solid platforms need to be built acting together with other countries. For the water economy, new technologies need to be applied to save and use water more efficiently. 70% of water consumption is in agriculture with government subsidies allotted to modern irrigation systems and public awareness campaigns.

Ameenah Gurib-Fakim from Mauritius noted that there is no “size fits all” when it comes to agricultural practices in the world. The African continent will reach 2 billion
people by 2050 home to 60% of the world arable land reliant on rainfall generating less than 5% of GHG emissions. So far, Africa has been a net importer of food representing $35 billion/year. Food security remains the main concern of African populations. The scenario on the continent is one where 70% of the food produced is by smallholder farmers. Over 55% of the young interviewed intend to leave the continent so how can they encouraged to stay in the agricultural sector? Biodiversity needs to be addressed as well as gender concerns: the face of agriculture in Africa is a woman who feeds the continent but with no access to land, capital, or proper technologies leading to a loss of 14% of food production globally but by 50% in Africa before even reaching the consumer.

Allan Mustard from the United States underlined that 50% of the world's population lives on $6/day and 25% on less than $4/day! When food prices increase then food security is threatened pushing many into outright hunger. A perfect storm is in the making in nitrogen fertilizers with Russia the biggest producer. In agricultural trade logistics, if the Black Sea is closed then trade disruption comes about as well as in stocks drawdowns for cereal grains with the world consuming 3 billion tons/year and 25% of the wheat produced in the world going into international trade: if these trade channels are disrupted then prices necessarily rise. The policy imperative is to provide income support to the poorest of the poor. Looking 20-30 years into the future, additional perfect storms are on the horizon: rising water stress notably in wheat and rice producing China, India and the U.S. with rain falls no longer predictable nor reliable is an issue because of climate change.
Agriculture is heavily dependent on hydrocarbons but as the world shifts to renewable energy supplies, will modern science propose alternatives to this dependency? On land use, land under crops is growing but coming at a cost: out of 224 countries, crop increased in 103 and notably in Argentina, Brazil, Indonesia and Malaysia but through the destruction of rain forests and pastures: from 200 to 2019, cropland grew by over 30 million hectares while in the U.S. it fell by 18 million thus the developed world is fuelling an environmental catastrophe.

Barbara Stinson from the United States showed a message of optimism noting the positive work undertaken in the world to address the aforementioned challenges. Poverty and hunger are tied together with 800 million malnourished and 3 billion who cannot afford a healthy diet: there is no global security in the absence of food security. The World Food Prize Foundation recognized 51 laureates in 25 countries in the last 35 years. In 2022, the laureates addressed the triple threat of Covid, climate and the 53 ongoing conflicts worldwide. The Foundation identifies and upscales solutions for the global food crisis and notably this year the effect of climate models on agricultural production. Optimism prevails on smart agricultural production.
people by 2050 home to 60% of the world arable land reliant on rainfall generating less than 5% of GHG emissions. So far, Africa has been a net importer of food representing $35 billion/year. Food security remains the main concern of African populations. The scenario on the continent is one where 70% of the food produced is by smallholder farmers. Over 55% of the young interviewed intend to leave the continent so how can they encouraged to stay in the agricultural sector? Biodiversity needs to be addressed as well as gender concerns: the face of agriculture in Africa is a woman who feeds the continent but with no access to land, capital, or proper technologies leading to a loss of 14% of food production globally but by 50% in Africa before even reaching the consumer production such as the creation of drought resistant varieties of crops in Africa, innovative water management solutions combined with drought resistant rice and soil-centric approaches that integrate less water, fertiliser, tillage and increase production in South America.

The moderator recalled the Great Green Wall initiative in Africa launched in 2007 representing 8 000 km of reforestation and agriculture and opened the discussion to the floor. A participant noted that fifty years down the road, the same concerns on food security are signalled so that a radical rethinking on how international cooperation is being carried out is much required.
The panel responded with the Reform of the UN Food System underway as well as reforms on the African continent when small farmers are given appropriate existing technological tools on site. Climate change has changed the distribution of sufficient water worldwide with hot spots getting hotter and floods increasing elsewhere: the time has come to transform the “food, water and agriculture” focus of the FAO organisation into “water, food and agriculture”. India today is an exporter of food products due to technological transformation. Water has become highly important with a daily consumption of 2700 litres/day when integrating food consumption i.e. 1 litre/calorie. New transformations between the hydrological and ecological cycles and climate change are underway. The food and agricultural sectors contribute to 15% of climate emissions but thanks to technological change can be flipped around and become a major absorber of Co2 emissions: the world is in a transformative moment. Questions were raised on resilient agriculture and on GMOs and on the future of the Amazon Basin Initiative responsible for 20% of world sweet water reserves requiring a change in agricultural habits and patterns.
The Azerbaijan minister concluded that the causes of the 1970s food crises need to be tackled then focused on fair accessibility and distribution of food but today on food production where land and water stresses are interlinked. Public opinion and education remain essential when dealing with food and agricultural issues such as on the GMO debate. Small scale versus large scale farming as a factor of resilience will depend on each country. Biotechnologies and GMOs are needed and the loss of glaciation due to climate change, particularly in Central Asia, will be reduced by 2050 to the point that the water flow will drop dramatically leading to the demise of agriculture in that region triggering an out-migration of 50 million people. Food waste also needs to be addressed with 30% of food lost or wasted. Also, traditional knowledge held by women, seeds sovereign banks, and hidden invisible water resources as well as the nexus “we produce what we do not eat, and we eat what we do not produce” will lead to a more secure world. The coming COP 27 should fight hopefully conclude on fighting against food insecurity.
As a continuation of the event that has been held in Shusha with the participants of the VIII Global Baku Forum, NGIC brought together once again the guests of the IX Global Baku Forum to Shusha in June 19, 2022. The conference addressed a variety of topics relevant to the main theme - rebuilding activities in Shusha including specific questions about the de-mining and other obstacles confronting developments in the liberated territories. The conference promoted a reflection on the role of promoting human security in the very structure of overcoming these obstacles and adopting a sustainable path. Indeed, the pattern of development that is being nurtured in Shusha and the liberated territories should be responsive to the aspiration of the local citizens, it should be a window on the concepts that should guide global action towards a future that rejects war and promotes peace and security for all humans, true Human Security.

During the day, the guests had an opportunity to discuss the topics, develop recommendations and take a tour to the special places, such as museums, mosques of Shusha in order to witness the progress of the region. Following of greeting the guests and announcing the program, Dr. Ismail Serageldin gave the floor to the chief of staff of the President of Albania, H.E. Ilir Meta to deliver the special message from the President. The panel chaired by Dr. Serageldin, “Vision of Azerbaijan for Reconstruction and Development of Karabakh and East Zangazur Economic Regions” was attended by Aydin Karimov, special representative of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan in Shusha district, Emin Huseynov, special representative of the President of Azerbaijan in liberated part of Karabakh Economic Region (except Shusha), Vahid Hajiyev, special representative of the President of Azerbaijan in Zangilan district. President Aliyev has articulated a vision for rebuilding and development in the liberated territories where the needs of displaced persons will be attended to, and the protection of the cultural heritage will be guaranteed, regardless of the religious affiliation of the building concerned.
Aydin Karimov generally focused on the progress we observe and what have been done so far in the region which has a historical, cultural and strategic importance to Azerbaijan as it was noted that Shusha holds a significant place in Azerbaijan history. He mentioned that it was decided to start the preparations of the very detailed master plan of the city together with international experts and it’s currently being on its final stage of preparation. One of the main priorities of this master plan is to preserve the city’s rich historical and architectural heritage, as well as to be able to plan developments on a sustainable level in order to reach all the goals.

Emin Huseynov talked about the lands that have been subject to an unprecedented extent of herbicide, ecocide and total ethnic and cultural cleansing for 30 years and gave statistical information. Due to his overview, 9 cities have been destroyed, 54,000 hectares of forests have been chopped down among which some rare pieces of flora, 66 out of 67 mosques have been completely destroyed, other cultural and historical monuments either destroyed or desecrated. He outlined that the principles of the government are to examine relevant practices elsewhere in the world. Do a thorough planning and ensuring effective coordination of all efforts.

He outlined that the principles of the government are to examine relevant practices elsewhere in the world. Do a thorough planning and ensuring effective coordination of all efforts. When it comes to governor’s framework, there’s a clear top-down and bottom-up lines of responsibilities enabling the effective coordination both vertically and across the various government agencies. To this end a special coordination headquarters has been set up under the president in close alignment with the cabinet of ministers. Among the many issues raised at the panel such as infrastructural works in Shusha, reconstruction and conservation projects for the monuments, as well as to minimize the ecological damage in the liberated territories had an important place. Vahid Hajiyev approached to the topic
in close alignment with the cabinet of ministers. Among the many issues raised at the panel such as infrastructural works in Shusha, reconstruction and conservation projects for the monuments, as well as to minimize the ecological damage in the liberated territories had an important place. Vahid Hajiyev approached to the topic from the side of the sustainability and ecology and spoke about the future plans of Zangilan in a context of transforming the region from a ruined city to the city that admits all the sustainable development goals where would give an impulse to the development of eco-tourism.
The presence of landmines in the liberated territories poses a major challenge to the development process. These silent killers can make major swaths of land undevelopable and uninhabitable. The tasks of de-mining are difficult, especially when the exact location of the mined areas are not accurately delineated. However, it remains a major task that must be undertaken. One of the ways in which Azerbaijan is trying to overcome the service challenges associated with the liberated areas is the use of innovative solutions. Currently, the special drones with on-board multi-sensor systems are deployed in the liberated areas. System produced valuable planning information including through application of artificial intelligence, data processing to support better targeted land release activities. Due to the speech of the Chairman of the Board of Mine Action Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan (ANAMA), Mr. Vugar Suleymanov, since the end of the war till now a total of 224 people have been affected by the land mines. Overall, almost 3300 people registered in ANAMA’s database since the first Karabakh war. He gave a brief information about the mine clearance activity in Azerbaijan and provided an overview of mine action plan as well as the current challenges, objectives and the intentions. He outlined that the Azerbaijan works with GICHD (Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining) to improve IMSMA (Information Management System for Main Action).

Former deputy prime minister of Georgia, Mrs. Eka Tkeshelashvili critically assessed the work of International Community and pointed at the weakness of the international law by explaining the lack of the efforts against using the prohibited land mines and weapons against civilians. Following the discussions on demining, Mrs. Eka didn’t skip to mention about the war which is ongoing in Ukraine. She pointed to Russian mining agricultural fields in Ukraine and stressed that the Africa will suffer from food security next year to come because there will be no harvest to harvest as the fields cannot be cultivated. This is already happening now with the full of understanding that the law is violated as much as moral principles of humanity. The last speaker of the panel, Zlatko Lagumdzija from Bosnia and Herzegovina talked about their experiences and learned lessons on placing the mines and getting rid of them during the 1992-1995. Mr. Lagumdzija reinforced the idea of using the international law as a key ingredient and pointed at the importance of support from the International Community in demining.
The session marked the closure of the conference by presenting the special edition of the book “The Magic of The Pen” - selected manuscripts from the Khamsa of Nizami Ganjavi, published by the Nizami Ganjavi International Center within the framework of the “Year of Nizami” announced by the decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan to Mr. Aftun Abbasov, the Chairman of the Board, Shusha City State as a tribute to the people of Shusha.
## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

### Current Heads of State & Government, Ministers & Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sefik Djaferovic</td>
<td>Chairman of the Presidency of Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilir Meta</td>
<td>President of the Republic of Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevo Pendaroski</td>
<td>President of the Republic of North Macedonia (video message)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michal Kaminski</td>
<td>Deputy Marshal of the Senate, Senate Republic of Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheikh Abdulrahman bin Hamad Al Thani</td>
<td>Minister of Culture of the State of Qatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed Aboul Gheit</td>
<td>Secretary-General, the League of Arab States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy McCain</td>
<td>United States Permanent Representative to the UN Agencies in Rome (video message)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egils Levits</td>
<td>President of the Republic of Latvia (video message)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salome Zourabichvili</td>
<td>President of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalia Gavrilita</td>
<td>Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova (video)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdou Karim Sall</td>
<td>Minister of Environment &amp; Sustainable Development of Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus</td>
<td>Director-General, World Health Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana Valovaya</td>
<td>Director-General, United Nations Office at Geneva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board of Trustees Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaira Vike-Freiberga</td>
<td>Co-Chair, NGIC; President of Latvia 1999-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Baderschneider</td>
<td>Board of Directors, Fortescue Metals and Fortescue Future Industries; Chair of the Board, The Global Fund to End Modern Slavery; former Vice-President, ExxonMobil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Kennedy</td>
<td>President, Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves Leterme</td>
<td>Prime Minister of Belgium 2006, 2009-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosen Plevneliev</td>
<td>President of Bulgaria 2012-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petar Stoyanov</td>
<td>President of Bulgaria 1997-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eka Tskheliaishvili</td>
<td>Deputy Prime Minister of Georgia 2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kateryna Yushchenko</td>
<td>First Lady of Ukraine 2005-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismail Serageldin</td>
<td>Co-Chair, NGIC; Vice President of the World Bank 1992-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Josipovic</td>
<td>President of Croatia 2010-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarja Halonen</td>
<td>President of Finland 2000-2012 (Digital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zlatko Lagumdzija</td>
<td>Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2011-2002; deputy Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2012-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amre Moussa</td>
<td>Secretary-General, Arab League 2001-2011; Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt 1991-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Tadic</td>
<td>President of Serbia 2004-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filip Vujanovic</td>
<td>President of Montenegro 2003-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sali Berisha</strong></td>
<td>President of Albania 1992-1997; Prime Minister of Albania 2005-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ehud Barak</strong></td>
<td>Prime Minister of Israel 1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gordon Brown</strong></td>
<td>Prime Minister of the UK 2007-2010, Special Envoy of UN on Global Education, WHO Ambassador for Global Health Financing (video)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emil Constantinescu</strong></td>
<td>President of Romania 1996-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiril Gaburici</strong></td>
<td>Prime Minister of Moldova 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mladen Ivanic</strong></td>
<td>President of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2014-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vaclav Klaus</strong></td>
<td>President of Czech Republic 2003-2013; Prime Minister of the Czech Republic 1993-1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moussa Mara</strong></td>
<td>Prime Minister of Mali 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giorgi Margvelashvili</strong></td>
<td>President of Georgia 2013-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Festus Mogae</strong></td>
<td>President of Botswana 1998-2008; Special Envoy of the United Nations Secretary-General on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Djoomart Otorbaev</strong></td>
<td>Prime Minister of Kyrgyzstan 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abdur-Rauf Al Rawabdeh</strong></td>
<td>Prime Minister of Jordan 1999-2000, President of the Senate 2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosalia Arteaga Serrano</strong></td>
<td>President of Ecuador 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raimonds Vejonis</strong></td>
<td>President of Latvia 2015-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viktor Yushchenko</strong></td>
<td>President of Ukraine 2005-2010 (Digital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valdis Zatlers</strong></td>
<td>President of Latvia 2007-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ameenah Gurib-Fakim**  
President of Mauritius 2015-2018

**Kolinda Grabar-Kitarovic**  
President of Croatia 2015-2020

**Petru Lucinschi**  
President of Moldova 1997-2001

**Stjepan Mesic**  
President of Croatia 2000-2010

**Peter Medgyessy**  
Prime Minister of Hungary 2002-2004

**Joseph Muscat**  
Prime Minister of Malta 2013-2020

**Petro Poroshenko**  
President of Ukraine 2014-2019 (Digital)

**Petre Roman**  
Prime Minister of Romania 1989-1991

**Mirko Sarovic**  
President of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2002-2003; Deputy Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015-2019

**Laimdota Straujuma**  
Prime Minister of Latvia 2014-2016

**Binali Yildirim**  
Prime Minister of Turkey 2016-2018; Speaker of the Grand National Assembly 2018-2019
**Former Deputy Prime Ministers, Ministers & Member of Parliament**

**HRH Prince Turki AlFaisal AlSaud**  
Chairman of the Board, King Faisal Center for Research & Islamic Studies

**Dora Bakoyannis**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of doGreece 2006-2009, Member of the OSCE Panel of Eminent Persons on European Security as Common Project (video message)

**Wang Chao**  
President, Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs; Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of China 2013-2019 (Digital)

**Tzipi Livni**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel 2006-2009

**Maria Fernanda Espinosa**  
73rd President of the UN General Assembly; Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ecuador 2017-2018; Minister of Defense of Ecuador 2012-2014

**Ban Ki-moon**  
Secretary General of the United Nations 2007-2016; Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of South Korea 2004-2006 (video message)

**Jan Kubis**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia 2006-2009, former Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and in Iraq

**Olena Tregub**  
Executive Director NAKO; Former Director at the Ministry of Economy

**Ana Birchall**  
Deputy Prime Minister of Romania 2018-2019; Minister of Justice 2019; Member of the Parliament of Romania

**Genndy Burbulis**  

**Hikmet Cetin**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey 1991-1994

**Lazar Comanescu**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania 2008, 2015-2017; Secretary General of the Permanent International Secretariat (PERMIS) of the Organizations of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC)

**Werner Fasslabend**  
Minister of Defense of Austria 1990-2000; President, Austrian Institute for European and Security Policy

**Aichatou Mindaoudou**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Niger 1999-2010, Deputy Joint Special Representative for the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) 2012-2013; Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General and head of United Nations Operation in Côte d’Ivoire (UNOCI) 2013-2017 Executive Director NAKO; Former Director at the Ministry of Economy

**Yashar Yakish**  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey 2002-2003

**International Organizations**

**Farida Allaghi**  
Human Rights Defender; Representative of Libya to the European Union 2015-2016

**Amitav Banerji**  
Projects Director, Global Leadership Foundation

**Ouied Bouchamaoui**  
Nobel Peace Prize Laureate 2015

**Saulo Casali Bahia**  
Federal Judge and Law Professor, Brazil and Trustee, World Academy of Art & Science

**Liberato C. Bautista**  
President, Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United
Voldemars Bariss
Head of International Cooperation Centre of the Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies

Sergiy Byelikov
Rector of Zaporizhzhya National Technical University, Ukraine

Robert Cekuta
US Ambassador to the Republic of Azerbaijan 2015-2018

Pierre Chabel
Coordinator of research on Asia and IR in Gredfic/ LézFEIM research Center, Le Havre University

David Chikvaidze
Head of the Secretariat of the Director-General of the UN Office in Geneva; Vice president, Swiss Forum for International Affairs

Paloma Cuchi
WHO Representative in Poland; WHO Regional Office for Europe

Amr El-Adawi
President, Arab University of Beirut

Susan Elliott
President & CEO, National Committee on American Foreign Policy

Andrija Erac
Networks Manager, United Nations Sustainable Development Solutions Network, Paris, France

Ulrík Fayle von Hentaller
Director, The Global Round Table

Garry Jacobs
President, World Academy of Art and Sciences

Igor Khalevinskiy
Chairman of the Board at Russian Diplomat Association, Ambassador-at-Large Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russian Federation

Benedetto Zacchiroli
President of the European Coalition of Cities against Racism

Eden Mamut
Ovidius University of Constanta, S.G. Black Sea universities Network, Romania

Katalin Bogay
President, UN Association Hungary; Founder, Women4Diplomacy

Volkan Bozkir
President of the 75th Session of UN General Assembly; Minister of EU Affairs of the Republic of Turkey 2014-2016; Member of Parliament, Ambassador

Vinton Cerf
Vice-President of Google, father of the Internet (digital)

Saber Chowdhury
Honorary President, Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU); President, IPU 2014-2017

Michael Christides
Former S.G. of the Permanent International Secretariat of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization

Edin Dilsberovic
Director of the Directorate for European Integration of the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Hakima El Haite
President of the Liberal International; Special Envoy for Climate Change of the Kingdom of Morocco 2015-2017

Amanda Ellis
former Ambassador of New Zealand to the UN, former Deputy Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Atanas Georgiev
Dean of Faculty of Economy, Sofia University, Bulgaria

Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu
Secretary-General, OIC 2004-2014

Mats Karlsson
Vice-President of the World Bank 1999-2002

Alexander Likhotal
President of Green Cross International 1996-2016; Professor at the Geneva School of Diplomacy and International Relations

Allan Mustard
former US Ambassador to Turkmenistan
Francis O’Donnell
Ambassador (ret., SMOM) and UN Resident Coordinator for Ukraine 2004-2009

Johannes Orphal
President Commissioner for Climate Protection and Sustainability, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany

Mila Popovic
Fellow; Chair, Partnership Development (Opportunities) Committee, WAAS and Founder, Evolving Leadership

Paul Revay
Former Director, Trilateral Europe, member of the Board of Trustees of Friends of Europe

Jeffrey Sachs
University Professor at Columbia University; Special Advisor to Secretary General on SD (digital)

Djawed Sangdel
General Director, Swiss UMEF University

Walton Stinson
Treasurer and Director, HS4A Global Human Security Campaign; Business Leader awarded for technological innovation by the US consumer electronics industry

William Taylor
Vice President of the United States Institute of Peace for Russia and Europe at USIP and a former U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine (Digital)

Tom Vandenkendelaere
Member of the European Parliament

Antonio Zanardi Landi
Former Diplomatic Adviser to the Italian President; Ambassador of the Military Order of Malta to Vatican

Erin O’Donnell
Program Development Officer, NCAFP

Sameer Patil
Senior Fellow, Strategic Studies programme, Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi

Janani Ramanathan
Trustee, World Academy of Art & Science and Director, World University Consortium

Karen Robinson
Program Director, Speak Truth to Power Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights

Hedva Ser
Goodwill Ambassador and Special Envoy for Cultural Diplomacy, UNESCO

Barbara L. Stinson
President, World Food Prize Foundation

Emir Suljagic
Director of the Srebrenica Genocide Memorial; Deputy Minister of Defense of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015

Nikolaos Theodosiou
Chair of the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Solutions Network SDSN Black Sea

Selim Yenel
Ambassador, President Global Relations Forum, Turkey

Alberto Zucconi
Chairman of the Board of Trustees, WAAS; Secretary-General, World University Consortium

Grigoris Zarotiadiis
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Young Leaders

Zaheer Allam
Young Leader, Mauritius

Maryna Goncharuk
Young Leader, Ukraine

Iva Matasic
Young Leader, Croatia

Graeme Strickland
Young Leader, USA

Eva Bertrand
Young Leader, France

Ada Ceremida
Young Leader, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Erol Nadir
Young Leader, Azerbaijan

Sabine Vaivodisa
Young Leader, Latvia

Anete Bike
Young Leader, Latvia

Shomy Hasan Chowdhury
Young Leader, Bangladesh

Salko Lagumdzija
Young Leader, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Neal W. Caldwell
Young Leader, USA

Kevin Khadavi
Young Leader, USA

Assen Plevneliev
Young Leader, Bulgaria

Taras Yushchenko
Young Leader, Ukraine
### Young Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zaheer Allam</td>
<td>Young Leader, Mauritius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Bertrand</td>
<td>Young Leader, France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anete Bike</td>
<td>Young Leader, Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal W. Caldwell</td>
<td>Young Leader, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryna Goncharuk</td>
<td>Young Leader, Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Ceremida</td>
<td>Young Leader, Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Khadavi</td>
<td>Young Leader, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iva Matasic</td>
<td>Young Leader, Croatia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erol Nadir</td>
<td>Young Leader, Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salko Lagumdzija</td>
<td>Young Leader, Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine Vaivodisa</td>
<td>Young Leader, Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assen Plevneliev</td>
<td>Young Leader, Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Strickland</td>
<td>Young Leader, USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras Yushchenko</td>
<td>Young Leader, Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NGIC Staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rovshan Muradov</td>
<td>Secretary-General of NGIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilaha Ibrahimli</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary-General of NGIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahid Mursalov</td>
<td>Chief Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asim Shahsuvarli</td>
<td>Executive Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toghrul Akbarli</td>
<td>Events Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehri Huseynli</td>
<td>PR and Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeynab Ibadzada</td>
<td>Nizami Ganjavi heritage research Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijat Ibrahimli</td>
<td>Graphic Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazrin Hasanli</td>
<td>Secretariat Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonakhanim Zeynalova</td>
<td>Marketing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhtar Hajiyev</td>
<td>Transportation Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM

“CHALLENGES TO THE GLOBAL WORLD ORDER”

WELCOME DINNER

15 JUNE 20:00 | WEDNESDAY

Welcome Remarks:

• Vaira Vike-Freiberga, President of Latvia 1999-2007, Co-Chair NGIC
• Garry Jones, BP Regional President for Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey
• Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President of the World Bank 1992-2000, Co-Chair NGIC

PRESENTATION OF THE BOOK:

“The Magic of the Pen" Select Miniatures from the Khamsa of Nizami Ganjavi

OPENING CEREMONY

16 JUNE 10:00-10:30 | THURSDAY

Moderator:

• Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President of the World Bank 1992-2000,

Keynote Address:

• Ilham Aliyev, President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

Remark:

• Vaira Vike-Freiberga, President of Latvia 1999-2007, Co-Chair
HIGH-LEVEL OPENING PANEL
16 JUNE 10:30-12:00 | THURSDAY

Moderator:

- Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President of the World Bank 1992-2000, Co-Chair NGIC

Remarks:

- Ilir Meta, President of the Republic of Albania
- Sefik Dzaferovic, Chairman of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Salome Zurabichvili, President of Georgia
- Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director-General, World Health Organization
- Binali Yildirim, Prime Minister of Turkey 2016-2018; Speaker of the Grand National Assembly 2018-2019 on behalf of Recep Tayyip Erdogan, President of the Republic of Turkey
- Tatiana Valovaya, Director-General, United Nations Office at Geneva
- Ahmed Aboul Gheit, Secretary-General, the League of Arab States

PANEL 1

16 JUNE 12:30 - 13:45 | THURSDAY

UKRAINE WAR, RESISTANCE, REFUGEES & RECONSTRUCTION

Moderator:

- Susan Elliott, Amb (ret.), President & CEO of the National Comittee on American Foreign Policy
Speakers:

- **Vaira Vike-Freiberga**, President of Latvia 1999-2007, Co-Chair NGIC
- **Kateryna Yushchenko**, First Lady of Ukraine 2005-2010
- **Kolinda Grabar-Kitarovic**, President of Croatia 2015-2020
- **Viktor Yushchenko**, President of Ukraine 2005-2010 (digital)
- **William Taylor**, Vice President of the United States Institute of Peace for Russia and Europe at USIP and a former U.S. Ambassador to Ukraine (digital)
- **Eka Tkeshelashvili**, Deputy Prime Minister of Georgia 2010-2012
- **Dora Bakoyannis**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece 2006-2009, Member of the OSCE Panel of Eminent Persons on European Security as Common Project (video message)
- **Petro Poroshenko**, President of Ukraine 2014-2019 (digital)
- **Tom Vandenkendelaere**, Member of the European Parliament

**LUNCH**

13:45 - 15:00  “SOCIAL MEDIA, POLITICS AND WAR IN THE 21ST CENTURY”

**Moderator:**

- **Paul Revay**, Former Director, Trilateral Europe, member of the Board of Trustees of Friends of Europe

**Speakers:**

- **David Chikvaidze**, Head of the Secretariat of the Director-General of the UN Office in Geneva; Vice president, Swiss Forum for International Affairs
- **Michal Kaminski**, Deputy Marshal of the Senate, Senate Republic of Poland
PANEL 2

15:00 - 16:15

RETHINKING THE GLOBAL SECURITY ARCHITECTURE & THE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

Moderator:

• Yves Leterme, Prime Minister of Belgium 2008, 2009-2011

Speakers:

• HRH Prince Turki AlFaisal AlSaud, Chairman of the Board, King Faisal Center for Research & Islamic Studies
• Hikmat Hajiyev, Assistant to the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Head of the Department of Foreign Policy Affairs of the Presidential Administration of the Republic of Azerbaijan
• Binali Yildirim, Prime Minister of Turkey 2016-2018; Speaker of the Grand National Assembly 2018-2019
• Tzipi Livni, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel 2006-2009
• Giorgi Margvelashvili, President of Georgia 2013-2018
• Alexander Likhotov, President of Green Cross International 1996-2016; Professor at the Geneva School of Diplomacy and International Relations
• Wang Chao, President, Chinese People’s Institute of Foreign Affairs; Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs People's Republic of China 2013-2019 (digital)
• Petro Poroshenko, President of Ukraine 2014-2019 (digital)
• Tom Vandenkerckelaere, Member of the European Parliament

PANEL 3

16:30 - 17:45

TODAY’S THREATS TO ENERGY SECURITY: THEIR NATURE, SCOPE, & THE NEED TO ADDRESS THEM IN NEW, WISE WAYS

Moderator:

• Robert Cekuta, former Ambassador of USA to the Republic of Azerbaijan
Speakers:

- **Rosen Plevneliev**, President of Bulgaria 2012-2017
- **Jean Badertschneider**, Board of Directors, Fortescue Metals and Fortescue Future Industries; Chair of the Board, The Global Fund to End Modern Slavery; former Vice-President, ExxonMobil, Board Member NGIC
- **Vaclav Klaus**, President of Czech Republic 2003-2013; Prime Minister of the Czech Republic 1993-1998
- **Joseph Muscat**, Prime Minister of Malta 2013-2020
- **Elnur Soltanov**, Deputy Minister of Energy of the Republic of Azerbaijan
- **Vinton Cerf**, Vice-President of Google, father of the internet (digital)
- **Ana Birchall**, Deputy Prime Minister of Romania 2018-2019; Minister of Justice 2019;
  Member of the Parliament of Romania
- **Hakima El Haite**, President of the Liberal International; Special Envoy for Climate Change of the Kingdom of Morocco 2015-2017

---

**GALA DINNER**

20:00 Presentation of “**THE KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF THE FLAG**”
by the President of the Republic of Albania, Ilir Meta

- **Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus**, Director-General, World Health Organization
- **Vaira Vike-Freiberga**, President of Latvia 1999-2007, Co-Chair NGIC

Special Addresses by:

- **Sergio Mattarella**, President of the Italian Republic (Message) delivered by Claudio Taffuri, Ambassador of the Italian Republic to the Republic of Azerbaijan
- **Egils Levits**, President of the Republic of Latvia (video message)
- **Stevo Pendarovski**, President of the Republic of North Macedonia (video message)
- **Miguel Angel Moratinos**, High Representative for the UNAOC, Under-Secretary-General (video message)
- **Tzipi Livni**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel 2006-2009
PRESENTATION OF THE NIZAMI GANJAVI INTERNATIONAL AWARD 2022


PANEL 4

GLOBAL HEALTH GOVERNANCE

17 JUNE 09:30 - 11:00 | FRIDAY

Moderator:


Keynote Speaker:

• Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director General, World Health Organization

Speakers:

• Maria Fernanda Espinosa, 73rd President of the UN General Assembly, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ecuador 2017-2018
• Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations 2007-2016; Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of South Korea 2004-2006 (video message)
• Jeffrey Sachs, University Professor at Columbia University; Special Advisor to Secretary General on SD (digital)
• Valdis Zatlers, President of Latvia (2007-2011)
• Teymur Musayev, Minister of Health of the Republic of Azerbaijan
• Mladen Ivanic, President of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2014-2018
PANEL 5

11:30 - 12:00  SOUTH CAUCASUS, RECONCILIATION, COOPERATION & INTEGRATION

Moderator:

• Valdis Zatlers, President of Latvia 2007-2011

Speakers:

• Elnur Mammadov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan
• Eka Tkeshelashvili, Deputy Prime Minister of Georgia 2010-2012
• Rosen Plevneliev, President of Bulgaria 2012-2017
• Lazar Comanescu, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania 2008, 2015-2017; Secretary General of the Permanent International Secretariat (PERMIS) of the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC)
• Ana Birchall, Deputy Prime Minister of Romania 2018-2019; Minister of Justice 2019; Member of the Parliament of Romania
• Hikmet Cetin, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey 1991-1994

LUNCH

13:30 - 14:45  “ACTING MEANINGFULLY TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE”

Moderator:

• Maria Fernanda Espinosa, 73rd President of the UN General Assembly

Speakers:

• Abdou Karim Sall, Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development of Senegal
• Chiril Gaburici, Prime Minister of Moldova 2015
• Joseph Muscat, Prime Minister of Malta 2013-2020
• Mats Karlsson, Vice-President of the World Bank 1999-2002
PANEL 6

14:45 - 16:00  “A CHANGING EUROPE & THE SECURITY OF THE WESTERN BALKANS”

Moderators:

- Susan Elliott, Amb (ret.), President & CEO of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy

Keynote Speaker:

- Ilir Meta, President of the Republic of Albania

Speakers:

- Ivo Josipovic, President of Croatia 2010-2015
- Boris Tadic, President of Serbia 2004-2012
- Peter Medgyessy, Prime Minister of Hungary 2002-2004
- Filip Vujanovic, President of Montenegro 2003-2018
- Sali Berisha, President of Albania 1992-1997; Prime Minister of Albania 2005-2013

PANEL 7

16:30 - 18:00  THE SEARCH FOR PEACE, STABILITY & DEVELOPMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST & THROUGHOUT THE ARAB & MUSLIM WORLD

Keynote Speaker:

- Ahmed Aboul Gheit, Secretary-General, the League of Arab States

Moderator:

- Amre Moussa, Secretary-General Arab League 2001-2011, Minister of Foreign Affairs
Speakers:

- **Ehud Barak**, Prime Minister of Israel 1999-2001
- **Djoomart Otorbaev**, Prime Minister of Kyrgyzstan 2014-2015
- **Yashar Yakish**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey 2002-2003
- **Jan Kubis**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia 2006-2009, former Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and in Iraq

### 20:00

**Dinner in partnership with the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights**

**Presentation of “THE KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF THE FLAG”**

by the President of the Republic of Albania, Ilir Meta

### 20:00

**Night Owl Session: “Implications of the war in Ukraine on the Middle East and Africa”**

**Moderator:**

- **Petre Roman**, Prime Minister of Romania 1989-1991

**Speakers:**

- **Amre Moussa**, Secretary-General Arab League 2001-2011, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt 1991-2001
- **Festus Mogae**, President of Botswana 1998-2008; Special Envoy of the United Nations Secretary-General on Climate Change
- **Aichatou Mindaoudou**, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Niger 1999-2010, Deputy Joint Special Representative for the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) 2012-2013; Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General and head of the United Nations Operation in Cote d’Ivoire (UNOCI) 2013-2017
- **Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu**, Secretary-General, OIC 2004-2014
**Panel 8**

18 June 9:00-10:30 | Saturday

“GLOBALIZATION & RISING INEQUALITIES”

**Moderator:**

- Francis O’Donnell, Ambassador (ret., SMOM) and UN Resident Coordinator for Ukraine 2004-2009

**Speakers:**

- Mats Karlsson, Vice-President of the World Bank 1999-2002
- Mikayil Jabbarov, Minister of Economy of the Republic of Azerbaijan
- Rosalia Arteaga Serrano, President of Ecuador 1997
- Katalin Bogay, President of UNESCO 36TH General Conference, former UN and UNESCO Ambassador of Hungary, Founder Women4Diplomacy
- Garry Jacobs, President, World Academy of Art and Sciences
- Laimdota Straujuma, Prime Minister of Latvia 2014-2016
- Emil Constantinescu, President of Romania 1996-2000

**Panel 9**

11:00 - 12:15

**Human Rights, Democracy & New Challenges in the 21st Century**

**Moderator:**

- Kerry Kennedy, President of the Robert F. Kennedy Human

**Speakers:**

- Petar Stoyanov, President of Bulgaria 1997-2002
- Kolinda Grabar-Kitarovic, President of Croatia 2015-2020
- Vaira Vike-Freiberga, Co-Chair NGIC; President of Latvia 1997-2000
- Sabina Aliyeva, Commissioner for Human Rights of th Repubkik of
- Hikmet Cetin, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey 1991-2002
- Farida Allaghi, Human Rights Defender; Representative of Libya to the European Union 2015-2016
- Chiril Gaburici, Prime Minister of Moldova 2015
- Olena Tregub, Executive Director NAKO; Former Director at the Ministry of
  Economy
PANEL 10

12:15 - 13:30  POVERTY, HUNGER & THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE FOOD & AGRICULTURE SECTOR

Moderator:

• Hakima El Haite, President of the Liberal International; Special Envoy for Climate Change of the Kingdom of Morocco 2015-2017

Speakers:

• Amb. Cindy McCain, United States Permanent Representative to the UN Agencies in Rome (video message)
• Inam Karimov, Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Azerbaijan
• Ameenah Gurib-Fakim, President of Mauritius 2015-2018
• Allan Mustard, former US Ambassador to Turkmenistan, agricultural attache/counselor to USSR, Turkey, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia, Mexico, India, Sri Lanka
• Barbara L. Stinson, President World Food Prize Foundation

PANEL 11

15:00 - 16:30  YOUTH SPEAK, WE LISTEN

Moderator:

• Kateryna Yushchenko, First Lady of Ukraine 2005-2010
CLOSED DINNER

19:00 HOW CAN WE MOVE FORWARD?

Moderator:

• Rovshan Muradov, Secretary-General, Nizami Ganjavi International Center

Speakers:

Ismail Serageldin, Co-Chair NGIC; Vice-President of the World Bank 1992-2000, Emeritus Librarian of Alexandria
Ilir Meta, President of the Republic of Albania
Kerry Kennedy, President of the Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights
HRH Prince Turki AlFaisal AlSaud, Chairman of the Board, King Faisal Center for Research & Islamic Studies
Hedva Ser, Goodwill Ambassador of UNESCO
Chau Chak Wing, Co-Chair of the Global Circle of the NGIC, President of Australia China Friendship and Exchange Association; Founder and Chairman of the Kingold Group, Chair of the Asia-Pacific Region WLA-Club de Madrid President’s Circle (video message)
Vaira Vike-Freiberga, Co-Chair NGIC; President of Latvia 1999-2007

* The IX Global Baku Forum promises to be an exceptionally rich and wide-ranging event, benefiting from the participation of many very eminent and outstanding people