

The establishment of a UN Parliamentary Assembly and the role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union

by Andreas Bummel

In recent years the demand that governments should establish a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations (UNPA)¹ has gained considerable support and momentum. In particular, the creation of a UNPA has been called for by the European Parliament (EP)², the Pan-African Parliament (PAP)³, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)⁴, the Commission for Political Affairs of the Latin American Parliament (Parlatino)⁵ and other significant international networks such as the Socialist International (SI)⁶, the Liberal International (LI)⁷, the Global Greens Congress⁸ and the World Federation of United Nations Associations⁹. The support is now coordinated in the Campaign for the Establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (CEUNPA)¹⁰ which was launched in April 2007 and whose Secretariat is operated by the Committee for a Democratic UN (KDUN).

One of the main objections proponents of a UNPA frequently encounter is the assertion that the “parliamentary dimension” of the United Nations (UN) is already provided by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and that there is therefore no need for a new parliamentary body.¹¹ This paper examines this argument. It addresses the similarities, differences and relations between the IPU and the proposed UNPA and identifies strategic options.

The IPU’s basic character: An organization of national parliaments

The IPU, established in 1889, is an umbrella organization of national parliaments, of which 150 are currently members.¹² According to Article 1 of its Statutes, the IPU “is the international organisation of the Parliaments of sovereign States.” The IPU’s goals are stipulated as follows:

“[The IPU] shall:

(a) Foster contacts, coordination and the exchange of experience among Parliaments and parliamentarians of all countries;

(b) Consider questions of international interest and express its views on such issues with the aim of bringing about action by Parliaments and their members;

(c) Contribute to the defence and promotion of human rights, which are universal in scope and respect for which is an essential factor of parliamentary democracy and development;

(d) Contribute to better knowledge of the working of representative institutions and to the strengthening and development of their means of action.”

Each member parliament designates a specific number of delegates to the IPU’s two annual assemblies. For each assembly, there are two categories determining the total number allowed per parliament.¹³ According to Article 25 of the Statutes, the IPU membership may organize in geopolitical, regionally based groups. Six such groups currently exist.¹⁴

The IPU’s role: The “parliamentary dimension to international cooperation”

Since the early 1990s, the IPU has been committed to providing a “parliamentary dimension to international cooperation.”¹⁵ In 1996 the IPU and the UN concluded a cooperation agreement.¹⁶ Similar agreements were subsequently concluded with

Published by the Committee for a Democratic U.N.

selfHUB, Erkelenzdamm 59-61
10999 Berlin, Germany
info@kdun.org • www.kdun.org

This paper can be found at:
www.kdun.org/en/documents/200810ipu-unpa.pdf

The author would like to thank Claudia Kissling and Fergus Watt for their valuable input and comments. The views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the Campaign for the Establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly.

UNESCO¹⁷, FAO¹⁸, UNDP¹⁹, ILO²⁰, and OHCHR²¹. In 2002 the UN General Assembly (UNGA) adopted a resolution granting permanent observer status to the IPU.²² The IPU may circulate its official documents in the UNGA.²³ The basic idea of this relationship is to create a direct line of communication between the UN and the national parliaments that are members of the IPU.²⁴ So far, two conferences of Speakers of Parliament have been convened, in 2000 and 2005, both of which elaborated on this collaboration.

The IPU report “Parliament and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century,”²⁵ published in 2006, asks the critically important question: „What is the value of even the most democratic of institutions at the level of the nation state, if so many of the decisions that matter to the life of a country’s citizens are taken beyond its borders, or by international institutions that are not subject to any democratic control or accountability?” However, concerning IPU policy, the 2006 report drew the same conclusion as the First Conference of Presiding Officers of Parliaments in 2000, which stated that

“the parliamentary dimension to international cooperation must be provided by parliaments themselves first of all at the national level.”

Commenting on the Final Declaration of the First Conference of Presiding Officers of Parliaments in 2000, IPU Secretary-General Anders Johnson notes that the declaration makes no reference to the idea of a parliamentary assembly for the United Nations “not because it was not discussed during the preparatory process but because it found no proponents amongst the participants.”²⁶ In September 2005, the IPU Secretary-General said at the High Level Plenary Meeting of the UN General Assembly that “the Speakers in parliament are not in support of the creation of any parliamentary assembly at the United Nations or elsewhere.”²⁷ Based on similar assumptions, the IPU in previous years also opposed the EP’s efforts to establish a Parliamentary Assembly at the World Trade Organization (WTO). According to the IPU Secretary-General:

“A parliament has two fundamental functions: to legislate, and to oversee the executive and hold it to account. The legislative function at the WTO is undertaken by government negotiators who are held to account in their national governments and parliaments. Providing a parliamentary dimension to the WTO that seeks to mirror the constitutional role that parliaments play at the national level does not make sense.”²⁸

Eventually an agreement was reached that an informal “Parliamentary Conference on the WTO” shall take place regularly, co-organized by the EP and the IPU.²⁹

It needs to be noted that in contrast to the Secretary-General’s views, there are also proponents for a UNPA within the ranks of the IPU.³⁰ The then-President of the French Assemblée nationale, Raymond Forni, for example, said in an interview on the occasion of the Speakers’ Conference in 2000 that

“without doubt it has to go farther, with the IPU finally becoming a real parliamentary assembly of the United Nations.”³¹

In any case, the majority of IPU members and officials seem to be content with the policy pursued by the IPU Secretariat and with the cooperation agreement with the UN that was only achieved after decades of lobbying.³² Efforts to strengthen this cooperation do not include proposals to develop oversight functions of the UN system. Instead the IPU stresses that it

“can provide support to parliaments with the aim of increasing their capacity to carry out, at the national level, their legislative and oversight functions with regard to matters which are subject to international cooperation at the United Nations.”³³

The conference of the Second World Conference of Speakers of Parliament in 2005 emphasized that it welcomes “the current debate on how to establish more meaningful and structured interaction between the United Nations and national parliaments”.³⁴ However the Final Declaration reaffirmed the position taken in 2000 which characterized the IPU as a mediator between the UN and national parliaments.

Transforming the IPU into a UNPA?

In accordance with the IPU’s nature as set down in its Statutes, the IPU’s goal is to strengthen the ability of *national parliaments* to exercise their oversight functions at the *national level* in matters of international cooperation.

In support of this goal, the IPU organizes hearings and specialized meetings at the UN. The IPU Secretariat suggests that these activities contribute to “holding the United Nations accountable to the people it serves throughout the world.”³⁵ Proponents of a UNPA argue that such informal mecha-

nisms are not sufficient. The former head of the German parliament's IPU delegation, Christoph Zöpel, notes that the meetings of the IPU do not attract any noteworthy attention in global politics.³⁶ Daniel Archibugi points out that the IPU's ability to demand accountability of UN institutions is seriously flawed because it does not exercise forms of parliamentary representation beyond the state level. To Archibugi the IPU appears "to be part of the problem, rather than of the solution".³⁷ The PACE resolution in 2006 concluded:

"6. The Assembly ... welcomes the growing association of parliamentarians with UN activities, in the form of strengthened cooperation between the United Nations and the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU).

7. This strengthened cooperation is welcome as it improves the familiarity of national parliamentarians with UN activities and provides them with a podium in UN instances. The Assembly, however, believes that in order to have a lasting impact on the legitimacy, accountability and representativity of the United Nations system, the involvement of parliamentarians in UN work should be further developed so as to become systematic and structurally linked with the functioning of UN institutions."

Eventually PACE envisages "the establishment of a UN parliamentary assembly with consultative functions for the plenary General Assembly".

In view of the considerable institutional knowledge and history which the IPU has acquired over more than 115 years, and its growing cooperation with the UN, the IPU should in principle be a suitable starting point to develop a UNPA. This approach was also identified in the report of the SI adopted at its XXIInd Congress in October 2003, which stated that "the principal starting point [to attain the goal of a UN Parliamentary Assembly] could be in the assemblies of the Inter-Parliamentary Union". The above mentioned resolution of the LI of May 2005 considered "the transformation of the Inter-Parliamentary Union into a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly" as being one of the options to be examined. As KDUN's strategy paper on the subject of a UNPA, first published in 2004, noted, "establishing the UNPA by a transformation of the IPU is an obvious way."³⁸ During a hearing of the EU-UN Working Group in the EP in December 2006, Miguel Angel Martínez, MEP and President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) from 1997-1999, and then its Honorary President, also stressed that the IPU should be the starting point to create a UNPA. How-

ever, Martínez admitted that "certain change" at the IPU would be necessary.³⁹

Character of a UNPA and major differences

In fact, the purpose of a UNPA is to exercise parliamentary functions *directly at the international level in its own right*, not as a facilitator for the work of national parliaments. The IPU has no such capacity. This is a major difference between the UNPA proposal and the IPU of today.

A UNPA would in all likelihood be established as a largely consultative body, using Article 22 of the present UN Charter. Limiting a UNPA to consultative functions initially and letting the new institution prove itself and grow over time follows the example of the early European Parliament.⁴⁰ Proponents of a UNPA argue that there need to be firm and institutional structures which formalize the "parliamentary dimension" and make the UN executive and its institutions *legally accountable* to a global parliamentary body. The EP for example demands that a UNPA be vested with "genuine rights of information, participation and control." Some of these powers would be conferred upon a UNPA from the outset; others would be added over time. Functions and rights for a UNPA which have been proposed for further discussion include, among others,

"readings of draft resolutions of the General Assembly and of ECOSOC with the right to submit suggestions for amendments;

the right to submit to the General Assembly and to ECOSOC draft resolutions for further negotiation and adoption;

co-decision with regard to the adoption of the UN budget;

co-decision with regard to the election of the UN Secretary General;

*[...] the right to submit, in accordance with Article 65 of its Statute, legal questions to the International Court of Justice."*⁴¹

The first international conference of CEUNPA concluded in November 2007 that "the Campaign pursues a politically pragmatic and gradual approach to achieve the eventual long-term goal of a world parliament." The term "world parliament" was used in full appreciation of the fact that this implies that the body eventually should have corresponding powers. It was thus agreed that "direct elections of

the UNPA's delegates are regarded as a precondition for vesting the body with legislative rights."⁴²

According to CEUNPA's appeal, the UNPA "could initially be composed of national parliamentarians." At the first international conference it was clarified that the campaign "supports the approach that already in the first step the UNPA's Statutes should allow governments to opt for direct election of their UNPA delegates if they wish to do so." The aspiration towards direct elections of the UNPA's delegates is another characteristic that distinguishes the proposal from the IPU, even if this may only occur after an intermediary phase. Whereas providing a connection to national parliaments is the very defining purpose of the IPU, for the UNPA a process of selection of UN parliamentarians by national parliaments is seen as a necessary but interim step, providing a measure of democratic legitimacy during the UNPA's initial phase. However, "if it comes to a partial or complete introduction of direct elections of the delegates in a later development stage the immediate personal connection to the national parliaments would get lost."⁴³

Furthermore, UNPA delegates would be called upon to take a global view and to represent the world's citizens. The IPU brings the UN closer to parliamentarians for the purpose of informing national parliamentary deliberations and decision-taking, mainly on the basis of national interest calculations. However, a UNPA brings parliamentarians into the work of the UN in order that they might function as a global parliament, viewing the world as a global community and considering first and foremost the global interest. It is expected that the majority of UNPA delegates would group not in national or regional geopolitical blocks, as at the IPU, but rather according to their political views and party orientations. In addition, not only will UNPA parliamentarians have a different perspective; the distribution of seats in a UNPA will also have to be more representative of the distribution of world population.⁴⁴

In practice the decisive question is whether the IPU actually aspires to develop into a UNPA. At present the IPU rejects such thoughts. This was once again confirmed when the Advisory Group of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs concluded at a meeting in July 2007 that

"the IPU should not advocate the creation of some form of world parliament which, in any case, would only ever make sense if there was a world government. The IPU should however serve as the vehicle of cooperation and interaction between the

*United Nations and national parliaments."*⁴⁵

The example of the Pan-African Parliament and the African Parliamentary Union

It is interesting to note that, when the African Union (AU) decided to establish the PAP, the IPU took a positive stance.⁴⁶ Following the logic applied in the discussion of the UNPA, one instead might have expected the IPU to argue that the PAP is unnecessary because a regional inter-parliamentary organization is already in place: The African Parliamentary Union (APU).⁴⁷ The APU was established in 1976 and has a membership of 40 national parliaments from Africa. According to Article 8 of the APU statutes, the highest organ is the "Conference of Speakers". In this conference every speaker is accompanied by a delegation of between three and 15 members of the national parliament.

In the circumstances, considering the determined political will of AU governments to establish the PAP, it would have been inappropriate for the IPU to argue that the PAP would be a duplicate structure because it also consists of delegates appointed from mostly the same national parliaments of the region. The PAP's nature is vastly different: It is the parliamentary organ of the AU established with the aim of ultimately evolving into a directly elected institution with full legislative powers. The UNPA's nature would be analogous to that of the PAP, only at the global level: As outlined before, it would be established as a consultative body of the UN with the view of being vested with distinct parliamentary functions in the future.

The regional example of the PAP and the APU demonstrates not only an inconsistency in the argument that a UNPA would be superfluous because of the IPU's work. It demonstrates that the IPU is a flexible organization and can adapt to changing political circumstances. In the last, 16th point of the aforementioned resolution of the PAP on the establishment of a UNPA the compatibility with the IPU is also indicated:

"Resolves that the establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly as envisaged before in no way contradicts the valuable and highly esteemed work of the Inter-Parliamentary Union whose aim it is, in particular, to foster contacts, coordination and the exchange of experience among Parliaments and parliamentarians of all countries

and to consider questions of international interest and express its views on such issues with the aim of bringing about action by national parliaments and their members.”

The example of COSAC in the European Union

The Conference of Community and European Affairs Committees of Parliaments of the European Union (COSAC)⁴⁸ established in Paris 1989 is another insightful precedent at the regional level. It shows that empowerment of national parliaments in an international institution, and the establishment of a direct parliamentary representation, are not mutually exclusive.

In the early years of the European Parliament, delegations to the EP were appointed by national parliaments, thus being at the same time members of the national parliaments and the EP. When direct elections to the EP were introduced in 1979, many national parliaments started to feel a loss of contact with Community policies. One important reason to create COSAC was to alleviate this detachment. Each national parliament of a EU member state is “represented by a maximum of six members of its Community and European Affairs Committee(s).”⁴⁹ The Protocol on the Role of National Parliaments in the European Union to the Amsterdam Treaty empowers COSAC “to make any contribution it deems appropriate for the attention of the institutions of the European Union and to examine Union legislative activities, proposals and initiatives.”

COSAC thus ensures that national parliaments are in touch with EU policy, while the EP is the direct representation of the EU’s citizens. It turned out that both is essential. In a similar way, a UNPA and the IPU could be seen as complementary institutions. The UNPA’s purpose would be to provide for parliamentary oversight and participation directly at the international level whereas the IPU, in accordance with its current nature, would continue to guarantee involvement of national parliaments in international matters.

Strategic considerations

So far there are no signs that the IPU intends to develop into a UNPA. Given its nature as facilitator

for national parliaments, and the described differences between the IPU and a UNPA, there are valid objective reasons for this stance. However, efforts to create a UNPA are at an early stage. In view of the increasing demands for a UNPA in parliamentary and civil society quarters, the IPU’s policy might change over time. Vesting the IPU with more formal rights in the legal relationship with the UN institutions might be an option to explore for the IPU membership itself.

At the same time, skilled structural reforms could solve the problem of maintaining the connection to national parliaments. While incrementally developing into a directly elected assembly, the IPU could still preserve a separate body representing and coordinating national parliaments. Especially in the first stage of a consultative UNPA an approach based on the IPU might help to reduce temporary duplications which otherwise would almost be unavoidable. Whether this option will get a chance will depend on the IPU.

In the meantime the strategic imperative is to focus on the establishment of a UNPA as a completely new institution. In this approach it needs to be recognized that during an assumed initial period, while the UNPA is consultative in its nature, composed of national parliamentarians and not yet directly elected, some similarities and overlaps would exist with the IPU.

However, as discussed above, the basic differences in goals, mandate and functions between the IPU and a proposed UNPA invalidate the view that a UNPA is not needed because the IPU already provides for the UN’s “parliamentary dimension.” The IPU will continue to play its role as facilitator of national parliaments.

However, considering the expected overlaps in the initial phases of a UNPA, especially before the introduction of direct elections in a majority of participating countries, there is a potential risk for the IPU to lose impact and relevance once a UNPA is established. A UNPA which quickly assumes more functions and powers but largely continues to be composed of national parliamentarians would change the political setting for the IPU considerably. The IPU would no longer monopolize parliamentarians’ interaction with the UN at the international level. This might explain the opposition which the establishment of a UNPA currently faces within the ranks of the IPU, especially in the Secretariat.

Conclusion

The UNPA provides a pragmatic response to the global governance democratic deficit which is not offered by the IPU. The objection that there is no need for a UNPA because the IPU already is the “parliamentary dimension” of the UN does not take account of the basic differences between both institutions. Still, this untenable argument is often used as a convenient way to sidestep the entire debate and to negate the significance and unique nature of a UNPA.

Again in brief: The IPU is an association of national parliaments which assists them to improve their oversight at the national level in matters of international nature. The UNPA’s purpose, by contrast, is to exercise parliamentary functions directly at the international level in its own right. While the IPU is an association of national parliaments (and thus national parliamentarians), it is expected that a UNPA will eventually be largely directly elected. Even if this might be far in the future, the example of the

PAP and the APU shows that already in an initial phase, where the UNPA is composed of national parliamentarians as well, both institutions are not mutually exclusive. The example of COSAC shows that in the EU two similar bodies exist. A UNPA therefore would not necessarily replace the IPU’s function, quite on the contrary.

In principle, the IPU is an obvious starting point for the establishment of a UNPA. However, the IPU shows no apparent sign that it is ready to consider such a transformation. Thus the natural focus is on the strategy to establish a UNPA as a new body.

The more political support the proposal for the establishment of a UNPA gets, the more likely it is that the IPU will eventually consider joining these efforts. The door needs to be kept open. •

Andreas Bummel is Chairman of the Committee for a Democratic U.N. and Head of the Secretariat of the Campaign for the Establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly.

- Endnotes -

1. For details of this proposal: Andreas Bummel / KDUN, „Developing International Democracy. For a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations“, May 2005, (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/unpa-paper.pdf>).
2. European Parliament, resolutions A3-0331/93 of 8 February 1994, pt. 17 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/a3-0331-93.PDF>), and P6_TA(2005)0237 of 6 June 2005, pt. 39 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/B6-0328-2005-EP-EN.pdf>).
3. Pan-African Parliament, resolution of 24 October 2007 (http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/PAP_UNPA.pdf).
4. PACE, resolutions 1476 (2000) of 27 September 2000, pt. 13 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/1476-2000.pdf>) and 1476 (2006) of 23 January 2006, pt. 11 (http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/CoE-PA_1476_2006.pdf).
5. Latin American Parliament, Commission for Political Affairs, declaration of 12 June 2008 (http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/PARLATINO_UNPA.pdf).
6. „Governance in a Global Society“, report adopted by the XXII. Congress of the Socialist International, São Paulo, 27-29 October 2003, pt. 39, 47 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/XXII-Socialist-International-2003.pdf>).
7. Resolution adopted by the 53rd Congress of the Liberal International, Sofia, 14 May 2005 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/LI-Resolution-UNPA2005.pdf>).
8. Global Greens Second Congress, São Paulo 1-4 May 2008, final declaration, pt. 12 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/2008globalgreens.pdf>).
9. 38th Plenary Assembly of the World Federation of United Nations Associations, 10 November 2006 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/WFUNA2006.pdf>).
10. As of September 2008, the campaign is supported, among others, by over 500 members of parliament and around 150 non-governmental organizations from across the world. More information at <http://en.unpacampaign.org/>.
11. For example, the Permanent Representative of Germany to the UN, Thomas Matussek, wrote

- in a letter of 19 September 2006 addressed to KDUN that “Germany regards the IPU as it stands right now” as “the adequate forum” for “parliamentary involvement in international contexts”. Furthermore, asked for his view on the UNPA-Campaign by Thomas Lowry MP, Irish Foreign Minister Dermot Ahern answered on 5 April 2007 that the “Interparliamentary Union already brings parliaments together and has regular meetings in the margins of the UN General Assembly”.
12. See <http://www.ipu.org/english/membshp.htm> (retrieved on 16 September 2008).
 13. Article 10: „[...] 2. The number of members of Parliament appointed as delegates to the first annual session of the Assembly by a Member of the Union shall in no case exceed eight in respect of Parliaments of countries with a population of less than one hundred million inhabitants, or ten in respect of Parliaments of countries with a population of one hundred million inhabitants or more. The number of delegates to the second annual session shall not exceed five, or seven for Parliaments of countries with a population of one hundred million inhabitants or more.“
 14. Africa, Arab group, Asia-Pacific, Eurasia, Latin America and Twelve Plus (as of 16 September 2008).
 15. „Cooperation between the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the United Nations“, Report adopted without a vote by the IPU Council at its 168th session (Havana, 7 April 2001), Inter-Parliamentary Union, 105th Conference - Reports, Decisions and Resolutions of the IPU Council, p. 46
 16. United Nations and Inter-Parliamentary Union Cooperation Agreement, 24 July 1996.
 17. Agreement of Cooperation between the UNESCO and the IPU, 26 June 1997.
 18. Cooperation Agreement between the FAO and the IPU, 12 August 1997.
 19. Programme of Cooperation between UNDP and the IPU, 27 October 1998.
 20. Cooperation Agreement between the ILO and the IPU, 27 May 1999.
 21. Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation between the IPU and the OHCHR, 2 July 1999.
 22. A/RES/57/32 of 19 November 2002.
 23. A/RES/57/47 of 16 January 2003, pt. 3
 24. The IPU occasionally describes itself as being the UN’s „parliamentary counterpart“.
 25. David Beetham / IPU, „Parliament and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century. A Guide to Good Practice“, 2006, p. 156.
 26. Anders B. Johnsson, „A Parliamentary Dimension to International Cooperation“, in: „A Reader on Second Assembly & Parliamentary Proposals“, ed. By Saul H. Mendlovitz and Barbara Walker, Center for UN Reform Education, May 2003, p. 24
 27. Statement by Anders B. Johnsson, Secretary General of the IPU, at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the UNGA, September 16, 2005.
 28. Johnsson, 2003, op. cit., p. 28.
 29. So far, such conferences were convened in February 2003 in Geneva, September 2003 in Cancún, November 2004 in Brussels, December 2005 in Hong Kong, December 2006 in Geneva and September 2008 in Geneva. This agreement notwithstanding, EP resolution P6_TA(2008)0180 of 24 April 2008 again included the call for a WTO-PA, see pt. 19 (<http://www.kdun.org/en/documents/2008EPWTO.pdf>).
 30. The Speaker of the Senate of Canada, Gil Molgat, stated in 2000 that „[the IPU] deserves to be recognized as a world parliament and its status at the UN modified accordingly“, see Canadian Parliamentary Review, Vol. 23 no. 4, 2000; The Speakers of Parliament of Uganda and Rwanda, Edward Sekandi and Alfred Mukezamfura, were among the initial signatories of CEUNPA’s appeal for a UNPA.
 31. Interview de M. Raymond Forni, Le Journal de l’Union interparlementaire, 28 August 2000, reproduced at <http://www.vie-publique.fr/cdp/003002361.html>.
 32. Claudia Kissling, „Die Interparlamentarische Union im Wandel. Rechtspolitische Ansätze einer repräsentativ-parlamentarischen Gestaltung der Weltpolitik“, 2006, p. 216ff.
 33. „Cooperation between the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the United Nations“, Report adopted without a vote by the IPU Council at its 168th session (Havana, 7 April 2001), 105th Conference - Reports, Decisions and Resolutions of the IPU Council, p. 47
 34. Second World Conference of Speakers of Parliament, UN Headquarters, New York, 7 to 9 Sep-

- tember 2005, „Bridging the gap in international relations: A stronger role for parliaments“, Declaration adopted by consensus, p. 2.
35. Johnsson, 2005, op. cit.
 36. Christoph Zöpel, „Global Democracy in the Nexus of Governments, Parliaments, Parties and Civil Society“, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Dialogue on Globalization No. 21, October 2005, p. 4.
 37. Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden, conference report „Globales Regieren ohne demokratisches Fundament?“, SEF News Frühjahr 2007, p. 3.
 38. Bummel / KDUN, 2005, op. cit., conclusion 6, paras. 25-31, p. 85ff.
 39. 13 December 2006, European Parliament Working Group discusses UN Parliament proposal, <http://en.unpacampaign.org/news/75.php>.
 40. The proposal to establish a UNPA with consultative powers only in the first step is increasingly questioned.
 41. Bummel / KDUN, 2005, op. cit., p. 101.
 42. CEUNPA, “Conclusions regarding policies of the Campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly”, November 2007 (<http://www.unpacampaign.org/documents/en/POLICY1107.pdf>).
 43. Bummel / KDUN, 2005, op. cit., para. 30, p. 88.
 44. Bummel / KDUN, 2005, op. cit., para. 39ff., p. 93.
 45. Meeting of the Advisory Group of the IPU Committee on United Nations Affairs, IPU Headquarters, Geneva, 12-13 July 2007, Summary Report, p. 2.
 46. „President Paez pledges IPU support for the creation of a Pan-African Parliament“, IPU Press Release, 1 July 2004, No. 162.
 47. <http://www.african-pu.org/>.
 48. For its French name Conférence des Organes Spécialisés dans les Affaires Communautaires et Européennes des Parlements de l’Union européenne. Website at <http://www.cosac.eu/>.
 49. Rules of Procedure of the Conference of Community and European Affairs Committees of Parliaments of the European Union (2008/C 27/02) of 31 January 2008.