
The Process for Selecting the Secretary- General of the United Nations

Center on International Cooperation
New York University

Mark Simonoff

Senior Fellow

First published July 2025

Revised October 2025 in collaboration with Thibault Camelli, Program Officer

**Center on
International
Cooperation**

 NYU | ARTS & SCIENCE

About the Author

Mark Simonoff is a Senior Fellow at New York University's Center on International Cooperation (CIC). He served at the US Mission to the United Nations (UN) from August 2008 to January 2025, most recently as Legal Adviser. In this role, he provided legal counsel to Ambassadors Linda Thomas-Greenfield, Kelly Craft, Nikki Haley, Samantha Power, and Susan Rice. Over his tenure, he negotiated numerous UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, including those addressing Ukraine, Syria, crimes against humanity, and the International Criminal Court. He has deep expertise in the Security Council and General Assembly procedures. Previously, he spent a decade in the Office of the Legal Adviser at the US Department of State, where he focused on a wide range of legal issues involving the Antarctic, Arctic, oceans, outer space, and the environment, among others. He also litigated cases against Iran at the Iran-US Claims Tribunal. Earlier in his career, he worked as a litigator in both private and government practice in Boston, Massachusetts, and clerked for judges on the US District Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. He has also taught as an adjunct professor at Vanderbilt and Cardozo Law Schools. He holds a law degree from Harvard Law School and a bachelor's degree from Yale College. Mr. Simonoff is a Senior Fellow at the American Society of International Law and a Life Member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

1. History of the Secretary-General Selection Process 5

2. The 2026 Process 14

3. Future Considerations for the Secretary-General Selection Process 17

Conclusion 18

Endnotes 19

Annex 22

Acknowledgments

The author also thanks Fernando Marani, Betty Wainaina, and Thibault Camelli for their inputs and support of this paper. Editorial support was provided by Symphony Chau and Thibault Chareton.

About the Center on International Cooperation (CIC)

The Center on International Cooperation (CIC) is a nonprofit research center housed at New York University. For over two decades, CIC has been a leader in applied policy that links politics, security, justice, development, and humanitarian issues. CIC's mission is to strengthen cooperative approaches among national governments, international organizations, and the wider policy community to prevent crises and advance peace, justice, and inclusion. Learn more at cic.nyu.edu and @nyuCIC.

© New York University Center on International Cooperation, All Rights Reserved, 2025.

Introduction

In 2026, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) will engage in a process to select the next Secretary-General of the United Nations (UN). The current Secretary-General, António Guterres, will complete his second five-year term at the end of 2026. This paper provides a historical overview of how the process for the selection and appointment of the UN Secretary-General has evolved over time. This process consolidated decades of practices and rules, and was recently refined by the General Assembly in its resolution 79/327¹ adopted on September 5, 2025.

In short, the process has evolved from a non-transparent closed-door exercise almost exclusively dominated by the Security Council, to a more transparent, inclusive process involving more active and engaged participation of the General Assembly.

1. History of the Secretary-General Selection Process

1.1 UN Charter: Article 97

The UN Charter contains only a brief provision on the process to select and appoint the Secretary-General. Article 97² states in its entirety:

“The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require. *The Secretary-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.* He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization.”

(Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, in order for the Secretary-General to be appointed, the Security Council must first make a recommendation. The General Assembly may not appoint the Secretary-General without a Security Council recommendation.

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) issued an advisory opinion in 1950 on similar language in Article 4 of the Charter regarding the admission of a State to Membership in the United Nations. According to the ICJ, the Security Council recommendation “is the condition precedent to the decision of the Assembly by which the admission is effected.”³

1.2 Pre-2015: A Non-Transparent Security Council Process

For most of the existence of the United Nations, the process to select the Secretary-General of the United Nations took place almost entirely behind the closed doors of the UN Security Council. There was **no formal solicitation** of candidates, there was **no formal nomination process**, there were **no public interactive dialogues** with the candidates and there was otherwise **no public vetting of the candidates**.

Rather, the Security Council Members discussed the candidates informally, amongst themselves. In the early years of the United Nations, this discussion was primarily among the Permanent Five Members and Permanent Five Members frequently proposed candidates.

Rule 48 of the Security Council's Provisional Rules of Procedure provides that:

“Any recommendation to the General Assembly regarding the appointment of the Secretary-General shall be discussed and decided at a private meeting.”

Prior to 1981, the Council would conduct numerous private ballots in accordance with this rule.⁴ Because the balloting was formal, the negative votes of Security Council Members sometimes resulted in the blocking of candidates. For example, the Soviet Union vetoed Max Jakobson of Finland in 1971, and China vetoed Kurt Waldheim of Austria in 1971 and 1976 before ultimately abstaining.

In 1981, Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim sought a third term in a race against Salim Ahmed Salim of Tanzania. China exercised its veto against Waldheim, while Salim was also subject to vetoes. The Council was deadlocked after 16 rounds of voting. The Council's President at the time, Ambassador Alora Otunnu of Uganda, requested the two candidates to step aside and devised an informal method of determining whether Council Members would “discourage” or “encourage” candidates. The result was the election of Javier Perez de Cuellar of Peru as Secretary-General.

This informal method of assessing Security Council Members' inclinations has evolved into the use of informal “straw polls” in Council elections for Secretary-General.⁵ In these closed-door straw polls, Council Members provide informal indications of how they would vote on candidatures prior to the consideration of a formal Security Council resolution. Because a formal recommendation by the Security Council was and remains subject to the veto of a Permanent Member of the Security Council, it was essential in order for a candidate to be recommended that there not be an indication of an objection or “discouragement” from a Permanent Member. After the use of straw polls, there was only one year in which a formal veto was exercised during a Secretary-General election. In 1996, the United States vetoed the recommendation to appoint Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali to a second term.⁵

Pre-2015, the General Assembly did not play a role in the selection process, other than to adopt the resolution appointing the Secretary-General after the Security

Council had completed its closed-door process. The General Assembly has never rejected a Security Council Secretary-General recommendation.

1.3 Transparency Reforms in 2015

The process for selecting the Secretary-General was substantially reformed in 2015. The General Assembly, after extensive negotiations in its Informal Working Group on the Revitalization of the General Assembly, adopted resolution 69/321 (2015),⁶ which set forth a much more transparent process that would govern the 2016 selection of the Secretary-General. This process entailed much more involvement of the General Assembly, and therefore of all UN Member States, in the process to select the Secretary-General.

That process, as set forth in that resolution, included the following:

1. A set of **criteria for the Secretary-General position**: The best possible candidate would embody “the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity,” and would demonstrate “a firm commitment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations” and “proven leadership and managerial abilities, extensive experience in international relations and strong diplomatic, communication and multilingual skills.” *(Paragraph 39)*
2. The President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council would start the process of soliciting candidates through a **joint letter to all Member States**, containing a description of the entire process and inviting candidates to be presented in a timely manner. *(Paragraph 35)*
3. The President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council would **jointly circulate the names of individuals who have been submitted for consideration as candidates**, together with accompanying documents, including curricula vitae to all Member States on an ongoing basis. *(Paragraph 36)*
4. The General Assembly would **conduct informal dialogues or meetings with the candidates**. *(Paragraph 42)*

1.4 Implementation of the Reforms in 2016

1.4.1 Thirteen Candidates Nominated

On December 15, 2015, the President of the General Assembly, H.E. Mr. Mogens Lykketoft and the President of the Security Council, Ambassador Samantha Power, sent a joint letter to all of the UN Member States soliciting nominations of Secretary-General candidates. **See A/70/623-S/2015/988.**⁷

The President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council circulated the names of all of the candidates who had been nominated to all UN Member States. The President of the General Assembly also invited each candidate to submit a vision statement.

There was no formal deadline imposed for the nomination of candidates, and nominations were mostly submitted over the course of the first half or so of 2016. A total of **thirteen candidates** were nominated.

Table 1 (below) lists all the candidates, in the order of their nominations (with references to their nomination letters):

Table 1: List of 2016 UN Secretary-General Candidates

Candidate	Country of Nomination	Nomination letters	Date
Prof. Dr. sc. Vesna Pusić	Croatia	A/70/687-S/2016/40	January 8, 2016
Dr. Srgjan Kerim	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	A/70/672-S/2015/1054	January 8, 2016
Dr. Igor Lukšić	Montenegro	A/70/906-S/2016/43	January 14, 2016
Dr. Danilo Türk	Slovenia	A/70/731-S/2016/128	February 8, 2016
Ms. Irina Bokova	Bulgaria	A/70/732-S/2016/139	February 9, 2016

Ms. Natalia Gherman	Republic of Moldova	A/70/752-S/2016/166	February 18, 2016
Mr. António Guterres	Portugal	A/70/768-S/2016/206	February 29, 2016
Ms. Helen Clark	New Zealand	A/70/813-S/2016/314	April 4, 2016
Mr. Vuk Jeremić	Serbia	A/70/827-S/2016/340	April 12, 2016
Ms. Susana Malcorra	Argentina	A/70/906-S/2016/473	May 20, 2016
Mr. Miroslav Lajčák	Slovakia	A/70/908-S/2016/492	May 25, 2016
Ms. Christiana Figueres	Costa Rica	A/70/979-S/2016/597	July 7, 2016
Ms. Kristalina Georgieva	Bulgaria	A/71/420-S/2016/829	September 28, 2016

1.4.2 Informal Dialogues

The President of the General Assembly held informal dialogues, or hearings with all of the candidates. Most were held in April, but some were held afterwards, after additional candidates were nominated.⁸

During the informal dialogues, the candidates each had two hours, which began with ten minutes for the candidates to make a presentation, followed by questions from Member States and regional groups. To enhance transparency, the dialogues were web cast.

These informal dialogues gave candidates an opportunity to provide detailed answers to specific substantive questions in a public setting and gave Member States and the public at large an opportunity to observe and evaluate the candidates as they spoke extemporaneously.

In addition, civil society organizations were able to participate in the process. As noted in a research report of Security Council Report, the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS) solicited questions from civil society. Civil society organizations submitted over 1500 questions from over 70 countries through an

online process. A “Civil Society Committee” worked with NGLS and the Office of the President of the General Assembly to select 28 questions, which were presented through a pre-recorded video during the hearings.⁹ Two to three of these civil society questions were presented to each candidate through these pre-recorded videos.¹⁰

1.4.3 Other Fora of Engagement

In addition to the General Assembly-mandated informal dialogues, there were other candidate fora. In July 2016, *Al Jazeera* broadcasted a widely-viewed town hall meeting with almost all of the candidates. In addition, the FUNDS project of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies, United Nations Association – UK (UNA-UK), and Global Citizen held an event with several candidates at The Graduate Center of the City University of New York, which provided a more informal conversational format for the candidates.

The Security Council also organized informal dialogues with all of the candidates. These informal dialogues were all behind closed doors and were not web cast or otherwise available to non-Council Members. These Security Council informal dialogues took place in parallel with the General Assembly informal dialogues. There was no formal report produced by either the Security Council or the General Assembly regarding these informal dialogues.

Throughout the process, the President of the General Assembly and the rotating Presidents of the Security Council held monthly coordination meetings, and frequent informal contacts, to keep each other informed of the activities of each body.¹¹

Candidates also met bilaterally with UN Member States, and in particular with Security Council Members with a focus on the Permanent Members. Such bilateral meetings are customary during election campaigns. Some of these bilateral meetings took place in the capitals of Member States.

1.4.4 Security Council Straw Polls

In 2016, the Security Council continued its practice of holding informal straw polls prior to considering a formal resolution that included a recommended candidate. During the straw polls, Council Members could indicate in a secret ballot to “encourage,” “discourage,” or express “no opinion” about the candidates under

consideration. As noted above, these straw polls are entirely informal but are understood to provide an indication of whether a Council Member would vote “yes” or “no” or “abstain” in the event of a formal Security Council resolution recommending a Secretary-General candidature.

The Council held a series of straw polls, beginning on July 21. Three candidates withdrew during the course of these straw polls. In initial rounds, the Council used ballots that were all the same color. In a later round, at the discretion of Council Members, the Council used color-coded ballots where the Permanent Members’ ballots were a different color. This indicated whether a Permanent Member had indicated “discouragement” of a candidate, which would have signaled a likely veto if there were a formal vote. The Council held its sixth and final straw poll on October 5, 2016. No Permanent Member indicated a “discouragement.” António Guterres was the consistent leader in the straw polls throughout the process. While the Council imposed a confidentiality requirement on itself and strictly limited the number of staff permitted in the consultations chamber where the straw polls occurred, the results of each straw poll leaked to social media within minutes of each round of straw polls.

1.4.5 Formal Selection and Appointment

On October 6, 2016, the Security Council formally adopted resolution 2311 (2016),¹² recommending the appointment of António Guterres to be Secretary-General for a five-year term. This was the formal stage of the Security Council process.

The Security Council formally transmitted this recommendation to the President of the General Assembly, which was communicated in a letter from the President of the Security Council addressed to the President of the General Assembly.

On October 13, 2016, the General Assembly formally adopted resolution 71/4,¹³ appointing António Guterres to be Secretary-General for a five-year term. This was the formal stage of the General Assembly process.

1.4.6 A More Transparent Process

While these formal steps were undertaken pursuant to Article 97 of the UN Charter, the informal process resulting from the 2015 reforms and implemented in 2016 led to a markedly transparent process, and larger buy-in from the broader community of nations and civil society.

In sum, by and large, the 2016 process to select the Secretary-General proceeded smoothly and was widely viewed as a resounding success.

In advance of the 2016 selection process, the common wisdom was that it was finally time for there to be a female Secretary-General, and finally time for there to be a Secretary-General from Eastern Europe. This is in part why there were so many female candidates and so many candidates from Eastern Europe. Yet the process resulted in a male Secretary-General from Portugal. If not for the open, transparent process in 2016, there might have been a hue and cry about such a result. But the reforms of the 2016 process enhanced the legitimacy of the result and the buy-in and acceptance by Member States and the international community at large.

1.5 The Reappointment Process of 2021 and the General Assembly Resolution in 2021

In 2021, Secretary-General Guterres decided to run for re-election. Portugal formally nominated him and the President of the General Assembly, and the President of the Security Council circulated his nomination to all Member States. See A/75/789 S/2021/180.¹⁴

Meanwhile, a staff member at the UN Development Programme (UNDP), Arora Akanksha, decided to put forward her own candidature for Secretary-General. Ms. Akanksha was a native of India and a citizen of Canada. No UN Member State nominated Ms. Akanksha. After some confusion, the Security Council decided that Ms. Akanksha was not eligible to be a candidate for Secretary-General. It was considered that “self-nomination” was not a legitimate basis to be a candidate for Secretary-General, and they had to be nominated by a UN Member State. Her nomination accordingly was not jointly circulated to the Members of the General Assembly.

Ms. Akanksha’s nomination highlighted an issue that had been glossed over in 2015. Under Article 97 of the UN Charter, there is no requirement that a UN Member State nominate a candidate for Secretary-General. Indeed, in the early days of the UN, as noted above, there was no formal nomination process, so Member States did not have to nominate a candidate. In its resolution 69/321,¹⁵ the General Assembly did not expressly include a requirement that a Member State nominate a candidate. In 2016, no individuals attempted to nominate themselves, and all candidates were nominated by a Member State.

After Ms. Akanksha's self-nomination, the General Assembly decided to clarify the situation. In its resolution 75/325¹⁶ on Revitalization of the Work of the General Assembly, the General Assembly expressly stated that:

“Nominations must be submitted by at least one Member State, in accordance with the ongoing practice.” (*Paragraph 56*)

The requirement of a Member State nomination does add an element that does not appear in Article 97 of the UN Charter. While it is unlikely that a viable candidate could proceed without the support of a Member State, the Member State nomination requirement precludes a situation where, for example, a prominent potential candidate is not favored by the government of that candidate's home country, whether because that candidate is associated with an opposition party or for some other reason, unless that person is nominated by another Member State, which is a relatively unlikely scenario.

In any event, Secretary-General Guterres was the only Member State-nominated candidate in 2021. On June 8, 2021, the Security Council adopted by acclamation resolution 2580 (2021),¹⁷ recommending Secretary-General Guterres for a second five-year term. On June 18, 2021, the General Assembly adopted resolution 57/286¹⁸ appointing him Secretary-General for a second five-year term.¹⁹

2. The 2026 Process: A Refined Process with Even More General Assembly Involvement

2.1 The 2025 Revitalization Changes to the SG Selection Process

In 2026, the General Assembly and the Security Council will go through the process of selecting a new Secretary-General to succeed António Guterres, whose second term will end on December 31, 2026. The General Assembly further clarified, refined and improved the modalities that will preside over the selection and appointment of the next Secretary-General, in its 2025 resolution on “Revitalization” (79/327).

Resolution 79/327²⁰ consolidated the previous improvements to the selection process, including the sequence and guardrails adopted in 2015 and implemented in 2016. In particular, the resolution maintained the transparency measures adopted in 2015 including the interactive dialogue with all of the candidates.

Recalls its resolutions 69/321 of 11 September 2015, 70/305 of September 13, 2016, 71/323 of 8 September 2017, 72/313 and 77/335, which introduced significant improvements to the selection and appointment process of the Secretary-General, and reaffirms that the process should be guided by the principles set out in the present resolution and previous resolutions.²¹

(Paragraph 39)

The Informal Working Group on Revitalization of the General Assembly adopted several additional reforms. Noteworthy changes include:

1. The ability for a Member State to nominate only one candidate, with the clarification that a Member State can nominate another candidate if the prior candidate has withdrawn, as well as the possibility of nomination by a

group of Member States. It is also noteworthy that, in 2016, Bulgaria nominated two candidates, Ms. Irina Bokova and Ms. Kristalina Georgieva.

2. The inclusion of ethics considerations, including the disclosure of funding sources, and the requirement that candidates holding positions in the United Nations should consider suspending their work in the UN system during the campaign, with a view to avoiding any conflict of interest.
3. Further transparency measures, including regular joint updates by the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council, including through a dedicated UN web page.
4. For the first time, the General Assembly highlighted the possibility of an unforeseen interruption of a Secretary-General's term and affirmed that an expedited version of the reformed process would be carried out.

The resolution made it clear that the process was not to encroach on the prerogatives of the Security Council, and the resolution did not include any recommendations on how the Security Council should conduct its part of the selection process.

2.2 Other Proposed Changes to the Process Not Adopted

During the negotiations of the “Revitalization” resolution, Member States discussed several other changes to the SG selection and appointment process, which were eventually not adopted by the Informal Working Group on the Revitalization of the Work of the General Assembly.

1. **Change the term of the Secretary-General to one non-renewable seven-year term.** One justification for this proposal is that the Secretary-General would not be side-tracked by focusing on possible re-election dynamics during their term.

2. **Request the Security Council to recommend multiple candidates** to the General Assembly. This would give the General Assembly a greater say and choice regarding who should be Secretary-General.
3. **Include provision for withdrawal of candidates**, to provide clarity on this aspect of the process.²²
4. **Conduct a straw poll in the General Assembly** (and not just in the Security Council). The idea behind this would be to give the General Assembly an enhanced role in the process and allow all Member States to express their view as to who should be Secretary-General.
5. **Establish a timeline for the selection and appointment process** to provide a roadmap for every step of the process. While the resolution did not include a strict timeline, it did provide some guidelines: the process will be initiated in the last quarter of 2025 and will conclude during the last quarter of 2026. The possibility of a late candidate (as in 2016) may need to be kept in mind, particularly if it is determined that an alternative candidate is needed to break a deadlock late in the process. Accordingly, some flexibility may need to be retained.

3. Future Considerations for the Secretary-General Selection

Since 2015, the General Assembly has consistently highlighted the fact that there has never been a female Secretary-General and has invited Member States to consider presenting women as candidates for the position of Secretary-General.²³ In the 2025 “Revitalization” resolution, the General Assembly further reiterated its regret that a woman has never held the position of Secretary-General.

The 2025 “Revitalization” resolution did not include any procedure for the participation of civil society. It is worth noting that the 2015 reforms did not include any specific provisions regarding civil society participation either. However, as noted above, civil society was actively engaged in the 2016 selection process.

Finally, while there has been some discussion of regional rotation, **there is no formal requirement of regional rotation for the position of Secretary-General.** Indeed, while there has never been a Secretary-General from the Eastern European Group, there has been more than one Secretary-General from most of the other regional groups. Table 2 below contains a list of all past Secretaries-General and their regional group.

Table 2: Overview of UN Secretary-Generals

Secretary-General	Country	Group*	Terms
Trygve Lie	Norway	WEOG	1946–1952
Dag Hammarskjöld	Sweden	WEOG	1953–1961
U Thant	Myanmar	APG	1961–1971
Kurt Waldheim	Austria	WEOG	1972–1981
Javier Perez de Cuellar	Peru	GRULAC	1982–1991
Boutros Boutros-Ghali	Egypt	AS	1992–1996
Kofi Annan	Ghana	AS	1997–2006
Ban Ki-moon	Republic of Korea	APG	2007–2016
António Guterres	Portugal	WEOG	2017–2026

**The UN Member States are organized into five regional groups: the group of African States (AG), the group of Asia-Pacific States (APG), the group of Eastern European States (EEG), the group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), and the group of Western European and Other States (WEOG). See Webpage, “Regional groups of Member States,” United Nations Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, n.d., <https://www.un.org/dgacm/en/content/regional-groups>.*

Conclusion

The Secretary-General's appointment process has come a long way from closed-door bargaining to a more open, rules-based exercise. The reforms of 2015, and now resolution 79/327,²⁴ have strengthened transparency and widened participation, but they have not erased the deep political dynamics that still shape the outcome.

As the 2026 election process is about to begin formally this autumn, the test is whether these improved procedures can deliver not just legitimacy, but also a Secretary-General with the vision and authority to lead the UN through a period of turbulence. In the end, the credibility of the process matters because it underpins the credibility of the office itself.

Endnotes

1. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 79/327, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/79/327, (September 5, 2025), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/79/327>.
2. United Nations, “Chapter XV — The Secretariat, Charter of the United Nations,” *United Nations Repertory of Practice of United Nations*, last updated July 23, 2023, <https://legal.un.org/repertory/art97.shtml>.
3. International Court of Justice, Advisory Opinion on the Competence of the General Assembly for the Admission of a State to the United Nations, (March 3, 1950), d8. <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/9>.
2. See Loraine Sievers, “The Procedure of the Security Council, Issues emerging with respect to the 2026 appointment of the next Secretary-General,” *SC Procedure blog post*, June 25, 2025, <https://www.scprocedure.org/chapter-7-section-5p>.
4. See “Appointing the UN Secretary-General: The Challenge for the Security Council,” *Security Council Report*, June 2016, p. 8, https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/appointing_unsg_2016.pdf.
5. For additional detail on past Council practice, see Issues emerging with respect to the 2026 appointment of the next Secretary-General,” Sievers, “Update Website of The Procedure of the UN Security Council.”
6. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 69/321, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/69/321, (September 11, 2015), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/69/321>.
7. United Nations President of the General Assembly and United Nations Security Council President, Letter dated 15 December 2015 from the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council addressed to all Permanent Representatives and Permanent Observers to the United Nations,” S/2015/988 (December 15, 2015), <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/814645>.
8. Informal dialogues were held on April 12, 13 and 14. Additional informal dialogues were held on June 7, June 8, July 14, and October 3. For more information see Webpage, “Selection and Appointment of António Guterres,” *United Nations*, n.d., <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/selection-and-appointment-of-ant%C3%B3nio-guterres>.
9. Security Council Report, “Appointing the UN Secretary-General.”
10. Volker Lehmann, “Historic civil society participation in General Assembly hearings with UN Secretary-General candidates,” *UNA-UK*, February 2022, <https://una.org.uk/11-historic-civil-society-participation-general-assembly-hearings-un-Secretary-General-candidates>.

11. United Nations Security Council, Letter dated September 13, 2016, from the President of the General Assembly addressed to the President of the Security Council, S/2016/784, (September 13, 2016), <https://docs.un.org/en/S/2016/784>.
12. United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2311 (2016), S/RES/2311 (October 6, 2016), [https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/2311\(2016\)](https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/2311(2016)).
13. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 13 October 2016, A/RES/71/4, (October 13, 2016), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/71/4>.
14. United Nations General Assembly and United Nations Security Council. Letter dated 24 February 2021 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council, S/2021/180 (February 24, 2021), <https://docs.un.org/en/S/2021/180>; United Nations General Assembly and United Nations Security Council, Letter dated 24 February 2021 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council, A/75/789, (February 24, 2021), <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3952647?ln=en&v=pdf>.
15. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 69/321.
16. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 75/325, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/RES/75/325 (September 10, 2021), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/75/325>.
17. United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2580 (2021), S/RES/2580 (June 8, 2021), <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3928741?v=pdf>.
18. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 57/286, United Nations pension system, A/RES/57/286 (January 31, 2003), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/57/286>.
19. For more details, see: "Selection and Appointment of the Secretary-General of the United Nations," UNGA, n.d., <https://www.un.org/pga/78/sq-selection>.
20. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 79/327.
21. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 69/321; UNGA, Resolution 70/305, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/RES/70/305 (September 13, 2016), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/70/305>; UNGA, Resolution 71/323, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/RES/71/323 (September 8, 2017), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/71/323>; UNGA, Resolution 72/313, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/RES/72/313 (September 17, 2018), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/72/313>; UNGA, Resolution 77/335, Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly, A/RES/77/335 (September 1, 2023), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/77/335>
22. For a discussion of these and other issues related to the 2026 selection process, see "Issues emerging with respect to the 2026 appointment of the next Secretary-General," Sievers, "Update Website of The Procedure of the UN Security Council."
23. See A/RES/69/321 (2015), paragraph 38 and A/RES/75/325 (2021), paragraph 68.
24. United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 79/327.

Annex: Resolution 79/327

United Nations

A/RES/79/327



General Assembly

Distr.: General
5 September 2025

Seventy-ninth session

Agenda item 121

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 5 September 2025

[without reference to a Main Committee ([A/79/995](#), para. 45)]

79/327. Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

The General Assembly,

(...)

Selection and appointment of the Secretary-General and other executive heads

38. *Reaffirms* the important role played by the Secretary-General in the context of current global challenges and in the implementation of the three pillars of the United Nations, namely peace and security, human rights and development;

39. *Recalls* its resolutions [69/321](#) of 11 September 2015, [70/305](#) of 13 September 2016, [71/323](#) of 8 September 2017, [72/313](#) and [77/335](#), which introduced significant improvements to the selection and appointment process of the Secretary-General, and reaffirms that the process should be guided by the principles set out in the present resolution and previous resolutions;

40. *Underlines* the importance for candidates to embody the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity, and a firm commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter;

41. *Recalls* paragraph 59 of resolution [77/335](#), and reaffirms previous resolutions on continued efforts towards achieving equal and fair distribution in terms of the gender and geographical balance with regard to appointments of executive heads of the Organization, including the Secretary-General, while meeting the highest possible standards;

42. *Decides*, without prejudice to the prerogatives of the Security Council, and in strict compliance with Article 97 of the Charter, that, starting with the eightieth session, the process for the selection and appointment of the Secretary-General should include the following steps:

- (a) The selection process should be formally initiated in the last quarter of the year preceding the end of the incumbent's term through a joint letter of the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council addressed to Member States, announcing the start of the selection process and inviting candidates to be presented, after which nominations of candidates are expected;
- (b) The joint letter should invite nominations from Member States and outline the principles of the selection process and notional events, inviting the nomination of candidates;
- (c) Noting with regret that no woman has ever held the position of Secretary-General, encourages Member States to strongly consider nominating women as candidates;
- (d) The candidates should be nominated by one Member State or by a group of Member States; each Member State may nominate only one candidate, individually or jointly with other Member States;
- (e) The President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council will jointly inform Member States as candidatures are being submitted;
- (f) A nominating Member State may withdraw a candidate at any time during the process; the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council should be notified of the withdrawal of the candidate submitted anytime during the process and the candidate should be considered automatically withdrawn; if a candidate withdraws, the nominating Member State may subsequently nominate another candidate;
- (g) Each candidate should provide a vision statement at the time of the nomination, which will be publicized on the dedicated United Nations web page; each candidate should be given the opportunity to present her or his vision statement; the President of the General Assembly will convene webcast interactive dialogues with all candidates, in accordance with paragraph 42 of resolution [69/321](#); the President of the General Assembly will engage closely, in a transparent and inclusive manner, with Member States;
- (h) Each candidate should disclose her or his sources of funding at the time of the nomination;
- (i) Candidates holding positions in the United Nations system should consider suspending their work in the United Nations system during the campaign, with a view to avoiding any conflict of interest that may arise from their functions and adjacent advantages;

- (j) The President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council should jointly maintain and regularly update a public list of candidates, including the name, nominating State(s), vision statement, curriculum vitae and campaign financing disclosures, published on a dedicated United Nations web page;
- (k) The Secretary General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council, in accordance with Article 97 of the Charter;
- (l) The selection process should end with the swearing into office of the Secretary-General-designate, as detailed in annex I to resolution [77/335](#), during the last quarter of the year prior to assuming office, bearing in mind the need to allow the Secretary-General-designate sufficient time to prepare for her or his term in office;
- (m) In the event of an unforeseen interruption in the term of office of the Secretary-General, the General Assembly and the Security Council should, upon notification from the Executive Office of the Secretary-General, convene without delay to initiate an expedited selection and appointment process in accordance with Article 97 of the Charter and the procedures set out in the present and previous resolutions;
- (n) The Secretariat is requested to continue to regularly update the repository of information on past Secretary-General selection processes;

43. *Reiterates its request* to the Secretary-General to continue the ongoing efforts to ensure equitable geographical distribution in the Secretariat and to ensure as wide a geographical distribution of staff as possible in all departments and offices and at all levels, of geographic posts, including at the Director and higher levels of the Secretariat, as set out in resolution [77/335](#);

44. *Reiterates* the need to ensure equal and fair distribution based on gender parity and as wide a geographical basis as possible, while also being diverse from a multilingual perspective, and in this regard recalls its resolutions [46/232](#) of 2 March 1992, [51/241](#) of 31 July 1997, [71/263](#) of 23 December 2016, [72/254](#) of 24 December 2017 and [77/278](#) of 18 April 2023, adopted without a vote, which contain the principles that the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity are the paramount considerations in the recruitment and performance of international civil servants, and that candidates' independence should be considered;

45. *Commends* the creation and further development of the Senior Leadership Talent Pool and the Senior Leadership Vacancies portal, requests the Secretariat to continue the practice of regularly updating these online platforms, calls upon Member States to submit the names and résumés of nationals who may be considered for positions of executive heads and senior management of the Secretariat, and requests the Secretariat to ensure that there is a preliminary public call for candidates in all senior appointments and to share on a regular basis with Member States a list of upcoming vacancies of senior-level posts;

46. *Urges* the Secretary-General and all United Nations entities to firmly uphold a zero-tolerance policy against all types of misconduct;

(...)