Due to these and other problems, the perception of the UN as the single body capable of international governance began to shift. During a June 1999 G-8 Foreign Ministers' meeting in Cologne, Germany, it was stated that if the Security Council does not live up to the challenges posed by the new international realities, other mechanisms should perhaps be sought. Moreover, the Security Council lost its exclusive right to determine what are acts of aggression, with the establishment of the International Criminal Court. The Treaty, leading to the establishment of the ICC, had profound implications for addressing crises in the international system.

Reform discussions usually centre around the expansion and composition of the Security Council membership, the feasibility of electing prospective Security Council members, and altering the Security Council's working methods. There is a broad agreement that decision making should expand and the veto mechanism should be addressed (for instance, the General Assembly should have a right to know why a veto was cast). Furthermore, the UN has become a 3rd World organisation on the basis of its membership. It is up to the developing countries to take ownership now. The UN has to adjust to new political realities, just as North-based institutions, including NATO, the EU, and the OSCE, did after the fall of the Berlin Wall through expansion. Guenther Altenburg suggested that while reform schemes abound, what we need is an overall guiding logic and political leadership. Without the political weight of the members, agreement on procedures will not be enough.

To initiate change public opinion has to be mobilised and political leaders must act. The question is where does the impetus for change come from? It is doubtful that the Millennium Assembly is the answer. While the need to address UN's financial situation (especially the question surrounding the contribution of the United States) could bring an intensive debate about ownership, it is unlikely it would crystallise change. It is clear to everyone that the UN has to be reformed. At the same time, doubts remain whether reform is actually possible under current circumstances. Despite some signs that the responsibility over global governance is diffusing (i.e., to the G-8, NATO, or ICC), the UN remains to be the single legitimate (universal) source of intervention in the world (through sanctions or military action). We should be careful, therefore, about our next steps, concluded Guenther Altenburg.

Andy Knight (University of Alberta) addressed questions relating to the legitimacy and representativeness of the UN Security Council. He pointed out that as discussions about reforming the UN system intensify, the debate about the need to restructure the Security Council becomes central. Being the preeminent authoritative body charged with the responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, the Security Council is being scrutinised by observers of multilateral governance who ask two key questions:
1. What are the ways in which international society and global order are changing?
2. Do we have the correct institutional structures and arrangements to deal with the new demands that emerge from such changes?

The Security Council has changed over the years to reflect changes in international society and global order since 1945. Reacting to the deadlock at the Security Council, stemming